THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For MARCH, 1805.

"Were an honeſt Briton to wiſh for a Sovereign, who in the preſent ſituation of affairs would be moſt capable of advancing our national happineſs, what could he deſire more, than a Prince, mature in wiſdom and experience; renowned for his valour and reſolution; and zealous for the PROTESTANT RELIGION; when theſe all happily concur in the ſame perſon, they are as much as can be ſuggeſted, even by our wiſhes, for making us a happy people." ADDISON.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

Theological Inſtitutes, in three Parts: 1. *Heads of Lectures in Divinity.* 2. *View of the Conſtitution of the Church of Scotland.* 3. *Counſels reſpecting the Duties of the Paſtoral Office. Appendix.* By George Hill, D. D. F. R. S. E. Principal of St. Mary's College, Primarius Profeſſor of Theology in the Univerſity of St. Andrews, and one of the Miniſters of that City. 8vo. Pp. 444. Bell and Bradfute and P. Hill, Edinburgh; Longman and Rees, London. 1803.

ON opening this volume we were ſomewhat ſtruck with one of the learned author's deſignations. In our univerſities we have no ſuch title as "Primarius Profeſſor," nor do we recollect to have ever met with it before. If, however, the Court Calendar be correct, the college over which Dr. Hill preſides has a profeſſor of divinity excluſively of the Principal; and as the volume before us aſcertains the fact that it conſtitutes a part of the Principal's duty to read lectures in divinity, we ſuppoſe that the Principal is called "Primarius Profeſſor," to diſtinguiſh him from his ſubordinate colleague and aſſiſtant. But, in this ſuppoſition, we take it for granted that he is expreſsly ſo deſigned in the ſtatutes of the college: for, otherwiſe, we ſhould be apt to conclude that, in aſſuming this appellation

pellation as a ſeparate title, the learned Principal had fallen into a ſmall miſtake. We are not, we acknowledge, particularly acquainted with the conſtitution of the Univerſity of St. Andrews; but we have been told that it was erected on the model of that of Paris. Now we know, with certainty, that, in the latter univerſity, *primarius* was the Latin term for *principal, ſuperieur*, or, as we ſay in England, *head of a houſe*. Thus the learned Gardin Dumeſnil, author of the "*Synonymes Latins*," deſigns himſelf, in his title-page, "Profeſſeur Emérite de Rhétorique, en l' Univerſité de Paris, au College de Harcourt, et *Ancien Principal* au College de Louis le Grand." But, at the end of his elegant Latin dedication to the univerſity, he ſubſcribes in theſe terms: "J. B. GARDIN DUMESNIL, Emeritus Rhetoricæ Profeſſor in Harcurio, et *Antiquus* Collegii Ludovici Magni *Primarius*." It is evident that here the latter is a literal tranſlation of the French, and that conſequently, in the ſtyle of the univerſity of Paris, *primarius* was preciſely equivalent to *principal*. This circumſtance led us to entertain a ſuſpicion that Dr. Hill has miſunderſtood the import of *primarius*, as applied to his own office, and has inadvertently called himſelf *principal* twice. The ſuſpicion, we dare ſay, is without foundation; but we ſhould be glad to ſee the point cleared up, either by the learned Principal himſelf, or by ſome other gentleman who has paid attention to the original conſtitution of the Univerſity.

The volume itſelf is an elaborate work, which bears honourable teſtimony to the learning, induſtry, and reſearch of its author. Its diſcriminating principles are Preſbyterian and Calviniſtic. This, indeed, was to be expected; for Dr. Hill is a profeſſor and miniſter in a Church which is avowedly Preſbyterian and Calviniſtic. The learned Principal's preface, however, contains a paſſage which we read, we muſt confeſs, with no ſmall ſurprize.

"Although I have," he ſays, "departed from the order of the confeſſion of faith, and of all the other ſyſtems of theology that I have ſeen, it was my duty and my with, to exhibit the received doctrine of the Church of Scotland: and if this outline ſhould fall into the hands of any members of the Church of England, it may give them information with regard to the preſent ſtate of theological ſcience, in this country, and it may correct ſome prejudices and miſapprehenſions which have ariſen in that part of the united kingdom, from the want of a fair expoſition of Calviniſm." (P. vi.)

If the members of the Church of England are, from this work, to judge of the general ſtate of theological ſcience in Scotland, they will, undoubtedly, form a high opinion of it; a good deal higher, we ſuſpect indeed, than it can juſtly claim: for the learned Principal, we have reaſon to believe, is very generally allowed to be *primus inter pares*. From his book we have, however, we moſt willingly declare, derived much information, particularly from the ſecond part of it, which treats of the conſtitution of the Church of Scotland. Dr. Hill, in truth, has attentively ſtudied the principles of his Church,

Church, with which he is, of courſe, much better acquainted than we can pretend to be. That he knows them more intimately than he does thoſe of the Church of England and Ireland can excite no wonder. We are, from time to time, furniſhed with convincing proofs that even the moſt intelligent and liberal-minded among the Scottiſh miniſters have not yet altogether gotten over the antipathy of their fanatical predeceſſors to epiſcopacy and a liturgy. They do not, therefore, very frequently, we preſume, beſtow much time or pains in examining the ſtandards of our Church. It does, however, appear ſomewhat extraordinary that Dr. Hill ſhould conceive the members of that Church unacquainted with the doctrines of Calvin. The learned Principal cannot, ſurely, be ignorant that, from the compilation of the Lambeth Articles in the reign of Elizabeth, to that of "The True Churchmen Aſcertained," in the reign of George III. the abettors of theſe doctrines have never ceaſed to diſturb and harraſs, with moſt reſtleſs importunity, the Church of England. If, therefore, her members have been, or are, but ill informed with regard to Calviniſm, their want of information muſt, certainly, be aſcribed entirely to their own indolence or dulneſs, and not to any deficiency of zeal in the Calviniſts to inſtruct them. But the fact is that no ſet of men whatever have more thoroughly underſtood, or more ſatisfactorily confuted, the wild and extravagant dogmas of Calvin, than the clergy of the Church of England. And, if the learned Principal were in the habit of regularly reading our Review, he would, perhaps, be convinced that there are in that Church, among both laity and clergy, ſufficient numbers, who, in order to comprehend and appreciate Calviniſm, require no aſſiſtance even from Dr. Hill.

We own ourſelves, however, not a little puzzled to know what Dr. Hill intends, by imputing "prejudices and miſapprehenſions," in the members of the Church of England, to "*the want of a fair expoſition of Calviniſm.*" Calvin's greateſt adverſaries, we think, muſt admit that, as a writer, he is learned, ſyſtematic, and perſpicuous. Such a writer is generally the beſt expoſitor of himſelf, and ſeldom has much obligation to thoſe who, however kindly, undertake to be his commentators. The works of Calvin are abundantly voluminous; and in all of them, eſpecially in his principal work "THE INSTITUTES," the great principles of his ſyſtem, whether leading or ſubordinate, are ſo pointedly laid down, ſo frequently repeated, and ſo copiouſly explained, that few authors, we conceive, ſtand leſs in need of elucidation. His notions are never, intentionally at leaſt, involved in obſcurity; and, to do him juſtice, he ſeldom ſhrinks from any of thoſe conſequences to which they fairly lead. But his fundamental tenets are ſo extravagant, or rather, to ſpeak the whole truth at once, ſo inexpreſſibly blaſphemous, that many of his followers conſider it as a neceſſary point of prudence to keep theſe tenets out of ſight, becauſe if expoſed in all their naked deformity, they muſt ſhock the feelings of every rightly formed mind.

Accordingly, it has been frequently obſerved that our Engliſh Calviniſts ſeldom quote Calvin, or even refer the reader to his works. We will not give ourſelves leave to ſuſpect that the learned Principal is actuated by a ſpirit which would incline him to conſult his own reputation, or that of his maſter, by varniſhing, diſtorting, or ſuppreſſing the truth. There are, however, ſome topics altogether unnoticed by him, which yet are ſo eſſentially connected with Calviniſm, that no explanation of that ſyſtem of theology can be conſidered as complete in which they are not included. Dr. Hill's expoſition is obviouſly defective, and in ſome inſtances, we alſo apprehend, erroneous. But, were it poſſeſſed of conſummate perfection, we might ſtill be allowed, conſidering it ſimply in the light of *an expoſition of Calviniſm*, to call in queſtion its utility. For ourſelves, as we have been, hitherto, accuſtomed to ſearch for the doctrines of Calviniſm in Calvin, we muſt beg to be forgiven if we continue to purſue the ſame mode of inquiry. For, while we have acceſs to the luminous writings of that celebrated reformer, we muſt deem it prepoſterous to learn his opinions from Pictet, Turretine, or Dr. Hill.

The "Heads of Lectures in Divinity," which conſtitute the firſt branch of theſe "Theological Inſtitutes," muſt, doubtleſs, be uſeful for refreſhing the memory, and aſſiſting the recollection, of thoſe who have enjoyed the advantage of attending the learned profeſſor's prelections. To others, of courſe, it cannot be expected that theſe ſhort notices will be of equal benefit; though they certainly point out a plan of ſtudy which may be followed, ſuggeſt many hints which may be improved, and recommend many authors which may be peruſed, with profit by all young divines. We cannot however omit to obſerve that, in various inſtances, Dr. Hill's enumeration of the authors who treat of the ſubject under conſideration is far from being full; and that, even with regard to thoſe whom he enumerates, his general mode of reference is ſuch as renders his references of very little uſe to thoſe by whom they are chiefly wanted. The principal advantage of reference is loſt, unleſs the particular place be pointed out where information may be found. This is ſeldom done by the learned Principal, who, for the moſt part, is ſatisfied with laying before his readers a mere liſt of names. Yet ſeveral of his authors are exceedingly voluminous, and write on a great variety of ſubjects. Thus he directs us to Michaelis, Leland, Lardner, Jortin, Macknight, Clarke, Warburton, Hurd, &c. but without any intimation in what part of their works the paſſages to be conſulted are contained. This we cannot but regard as a great defect. The ſtudent who wiſhes to have recourſe to theſe authors, for inſtruction on any ſpecific point, will thus often be obliged to throw away much time in ſearching for that inſtruction, while his labour, after all, may perhaps be in vain. To mark with punctual and accurate fidelity the particular places in thoſe celebrated writers where valuable information, on any ſubject of conſequence, may be obtained,

obtained, is, unqueſtionably, one of the higheſt excellencies which any author can diſplay; and this excellence Dr. Hill might, with very little additional trouble, have communicated to his book.

The learned lecturer's courſe, as *a ſyſtem of divinity*, appears to be extremely imperfect. Of this we need produce no other proof than that there is not even a ſingle lecture on the rich, extenſive, and important topic of natural theology. This ſubject involves ſo many great and intereſting queſtions, and ſo much has been written upon it, that we have no conception how a ſyſtem can be regarded as complete which does not commence by inveſtigating it. Yet the only notice, as far as we have obſerved, which is taken of it by Dr. Hill, occurs when the courſe is pretty far advanced; and it is there introduced only in a ſubordinate and indirect manner, for the purpoſe of illuſtrating the "Importance of Chriſtianity." On the ſtyle in which the author there ſpeaks of it we ſhall ſay ſomething when we come to the place.

The "Heads of Lectures" are divided into five books, which are ſubdivided into chapters and ſections. The firſt book is on the "Evidences of the Chriſtian Religion," and contains nine chapters. This part of the courſe ſeems accurate and full, embracing all the common arguments, and giving a luminous, well-connected view of the whole. If the outline here drawn by the learned profeſſor be ably filled up, of which we have no doubt, this part of the lectures muſt be highly deſerving of the attention of his pupils. As a ſpecimen we ſhall quote the laſt ſection of the book.

"It has been ſaid, that if the earth be divided in thirty equal parts, Paganiſm is eſtabliſhed in nineteen, Mahometaniſm in ſix, Chriſtianity in five; that Chriſtianity was not publiſhed till the world had exiſted ſome thouſand years; that it is corrupted in many countries; and that it leaves men wicked: and, from the imperfection of the effect produced, it has been inferred, that the means employed were not divine."

"But objections founded upon the meaſure of the effect cannot overturn hiſtorical evidence. They imply an expectation, which we are not warranted to entertain, that God will beſtow the ſame religious advantages upon all his creatures, and that there will be no delay in the communication of what it was his original purpoſe to beſtow. Much religious knowledge was diffuſed during the preparation of the Goſpel. The delay of its univerſal publication, may, in various ways, be preparing the world for the reception of it. The corruptions of Chriſtianity aroſe from God's employing the miniſtry of human means. It is a contradiction in terms, to ſay that religion ſhould compel men to be virtuous."

"*Shaw* and *Dick upon the Counſel of Gamaliel. Robertſon's Sermon. Butler. Atterbury. Jortin. Law. Macknight. Paley. Hill's* [the principal himſelf we ſuppoſe] *14th Sermon.*" (Pp. 25, 26.)

It is obvious here that the learned Principal evades, inſtead of anſwering, the objection urged from the late publication and confined diſſemination of Chriſtianity. Indeed this objection can never be removed by thoſe who exclude from the poſſibility of ſalvation

all to whom the Goſpel has not been actually made known. This excluſive ſyſtem fixes, in truth, an indelible ſtigma on the moral character of God, which can never be defended but by the doctrine which teaches that the virtuous Heathen, as well as the Jew and Chriſtian, will be ſaved through the atonement of the univerſal Redeemer; or, to uſe the words of an eminent prelate who is an honour to his age, "that millions who never heard the name of Jeſus will be redeemed and bleſſed for ever through the merits of his death." This opinion, we well know, is very different from Calvin's; but we alſo know that the greater number of Calvin's opinions form a continued libel on the moral attributes of God. And if, on this moſt intereſting ſubject, the learned Principal had deſerted his maſter, he would have been chargeable with no greater inconſiſtency than that of which he is guilty in another part of this ſame extract. For by way of reply to the obſervation that Chriſtianity has little influence on the minds of men, whom it ſtill "leaves wicked," he maintains that "it is a contradiction in terms to ſay that religion ſhould compel men to be virtuous." In this ſentiment we moſt heartily concur with the learned Principal; but, in doing ſo, it is almoſt needleſs to inform our readers that we *toto cælo* diſſent from Calvin. Man, in Calvin's ſyſtem, is a mere machine, whoſe virtue is, in no reſpect, his own, but wholly and ſolely the work of God. "*Prior pars operis boni eſt voluntas; altera validus in exequendo conatus:* UTRIUSQUE AUCTOR EST DEUS. *Ergo Domino ſurripimus* SIQUID NOBIS ARROGAMUS, AUT IN VOLUNTATE, AUT IN EFFECTU. *Si diceretur Deus opem ferre infirmæ voluntati, nobis nonnihil relinqueretur; ſed quum dicitur efficere voluntatem, jam extra nos quicquid in eo bonum eſt locatur.*" (Calv. Inſt. Lib. II. Cap. 3. §9.) Accordingly it is the uniform language of this reformer that the faithful ACT PASSIVELY; (Inſt. II. 5. 11.) that man has no power whatever either to reject or embrace the offered grace of God; (II. 3. 11.) and that thoſe who affirm that man can CO-OPERATE with the grace of God are in a moſt peſtilent error. (Ibid.)

The ſecond book of the author's Syllabus is thus intitled, "General View of the Scripture Syſtem, and Plan of analyſing it." This book is divided into ſeven chapters. In the firſt, the learned Principal treats of inſpiration, his notion of which appears to us to be the only one which is capable of being rationally maintained. "All degrees of inſpiration," he rightly remarks, "are equally poſſible." He does not, however, think that the ſacred penmen always wrote under what he calls "the inſpiration of ſuggeſtion." His opinion is that, "by the continual ſuperintendance of the Spirit, they were furniſhed in the Goſpels, in the doctrinal parts of the Epiſtles, and in the prophecies which they delivered, with that meaſure of inſpiration which the nature of the ſubject required, ſo as to render their writings the infallible ſtandard of Chriſtian faith." (P. 29.)

The

The third chapter of this book is on "the Importance of Chriſtianity," which is here conſidered in a twofold view, as a "republication of natural religion," and as a "method of ſaving ſinners." We ſhall now inſert the learned Author's account of natural religion alluded to above. "Natural religion," he ſays, "which conſiſts of the knowledge of God, the obligations, and the hopes that may be deduced from the light of nature, is founded in the conſtitution of the human mind; was tranſmitted by tradition from the firſt man; is ſuppoſed in Scripture; and had no original defect." (P. 31.) Therefore we find ourſelves conſiderably at a loſs to comprehend the learned Principal's ſyſtem. The characters given of natural religion ſeem ſomewhat equivocal, and not quite conſiſtent with one another, or with what follows. By ſaying that this religion is founded in the conſtitution of the human mind, the profeſſor would appear to regard it as originally derived from the exertions of man's natural, unaſſiſted, powers. By ſaying that it was tranſmitted by tradition from the firſt man, he would appear to aſcribe its origin to ſupernatural communication. The queſtion, our learned Author knows, has been keenly diſputed, whether, without the aid of divine revelation, man could have had any religion at all. On this queſtion we ſhould have been happy to receive a clear expoſition of the author's ſentiments; although, in conſequence of what we know to have been the fact, the controverſy is certainly more curious than important. Every principle of reaſon would lead us to conclude that man, at his creation, was not left to form his own religion; and the Scriptures poſitively eſtabliſh the concluſion. But whatever may be Dr. Hill's preciſe opinion with regard to the *ſource* of natural religion, this religion, he ſays, "had no original defect." If, indeed, it proceeded immediately from God, this is certainly true, but can hardly be true if it was the invention of man. At all events this ſyſtem of religion was ſuited only to a ſtate of innocence. So the learned Principal himſelf informs us: "Natural religion," he ſays, "is, by its conſtitution, the religion of thoſe who do their duty," and, therefore, "holds forth only doubtful grounds of hope to thoſe who tranſgreſs." But "man, by being a ſinner, is placed in a ſtate of depravity and guilt, in which there can be no religion to him, unleſs there be forgiveneſs with God." (P. 32.) Than this doctrine nothing, we conceive, can be more ſound. But we wonder how, with theſe views of the ſubject, the learned Principal could repreſent Chriſtianity as "a republication of natural religion." We are well aware that this language is not new, and that it has been held by men of the firſt abilities. But it is a mode of ſpeaking which we cannot, on any grounds, approve, and which, to ſay the truth, has contributed not a little to degrade Chriſtianity in the eyes of the world. Men are eaſily led by it to conſider the Goſpel as *nothing more* than a mere republication of the religion of nature. Yet no truth whatever, we conceive, is more certain than that the publication of the Goſpel is co-eval with the firſt tranſgreſſion. Chriſtianity, therefore, as diſtinguiſhed from for-

mer diſpenſations, or as fully proclaimed by our Lord and his diſciples, is not ſo properly a republication of the religion of nature, however underſtood, as of that religion which was revealed to our firſt parents immediately after the fall. Of this laſt religion, the only religion which is ſuited to the circumſtances of fallen man, all the ſubſequent revelations of God were, in ſubſtance, republications. In the early ages of the world, indeed, it was involved in comparative obſcurity. It continued, however, to be ſtill republiſhed, with ſteadily progreſſive and increaſing light, till, at laſt, it burſt forth with unclouded ſplendor, "in the fulneſs of the time," on the coming of Chriſt.

In the fifth chapter the learned Author obſerves that, though various cauſes have occaſioned controverſies concerning the proper boundaries between reaſon and faith, yet every ſound divine muſt admit that reaſon is of eminent uſe: 1. "In examining the evidences of religion. 2. In learning from Scriptures what are the truths revealed. 3. In repelling the attacks of the adverſaries of Chriſtianity. 4. In judging of the truths of religion." The province of reaſon is here well ſtated. But, as all men do not reaſon equally well, differences will ariſe with regard to the Scripture ſyſtem; and it is the duty of the ſtudent in divinity to make himſelf acquainted with this diverſity of opinions, and the arguments on which it is founded. Of theſe he may, the learned Principal ſays, "derive a general knowledge from Calvin's Inſtitutes, Marckii Medullæ, Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles, Moſheim's Church Hiſtory, tranſlated by Maclaine, and Stapfer's Inſtitutiones Theologiæ Polemicæ." (P. 37.)

The moſt ſuperficial divine cannot but remark, that, in this place, the learned Principal's liſt of authors in polemic divinity is miſerably jejune, meagre, and defective. It is particularly ſurpriſing that he ſhould have paſſed, without notice, the writings of Epiſcopius, Limborch, Chillingworth, and Hooker. He quotes, however, with great propriety, a paſſage from the Confeſſion of Faith, equivalent to the declaration contained in the firſt ſentence of our 6th article, that all doctrines and opinions muſt ultimately be tried by the authority of Scripture. The temper which dictated the following paragraph is, we think, entitled to the greateſt praiſe.

"The ſubject of my lectures is to go before you in the application of this principle, and to abridge your labour, by directing you to the ſhorteſt method of arriving at the concluſion. But you will derive more benefit from canvaſſing what I ſay, than from imbibing all that I can teach: and the moſt uſeful leſſons which you can learn from me are a habit of attention, a love of truth, and a ſpirit of inquiry." (P. 38.)

In the ſeventh and laſt chapter of this book, the learned Principal thus arranges the controverſies which have ariſen with regard to the Scripture ſyſtem:

"The Goſpel having appeared, in the general view of the Scripture ſyſtem, to be a remedy for the preſent ſtate of moral evil, provided by the Father,

Father, brought into the world by the Son, and applied by the Spirit, all doctrinal controverſies reſpect—either the Son and the Spirit, and the manner in which they were united with the Father; or the nature, the extent, and the application of the remedy."

"The firſt great diviſion, reſpecting the perſons, comprehends the Arian, a part of the Socinian, and the Trinitarian controverſy. The ſecond great diviſion, reſpecting the remedy, comprehends the Arminian controverſy, a part of the Socinian, and many of the doctrines of Popery."

"The Church of Chriſt being a ſociety founded by him, various queſtions have ariſen concerning Church government." (Pp. 39, 40.)

To the diſcuſſion of the firſt of theſe grand diviſions, the third book, conſiſting of ten chapters, is dedicated, on which we have no remark to make, but that every point materially connected with the great doctrine of the Trinity ſeems carefully introduced, and candidly conſidered. In the concluſion of this book, the Principal pays a well-merited compliment to the talents and erudition of a learned prelate, who is a ſhining ornament of the Church of England. "Lardner, Prieſtley, Lindſey," he ſays, "and the other Socinians of the preſent day, have found a formidable antagoniſt in Biſhop Horſley, who, in his volume of tracts upon this controverſy, appears far ſuperior to them both in learning and in argument." (P. 67.)

The ſecond of the above-mentioned grand diviſions employs the learned Author's attention in the fourth book, which contains eleven chapters. "Opinions," he obſerves, "concerning the remedy, lead back to opinions concerning the diſeaſe." And the opinions, he ſays, concerning the diſeaſe, or the effects which Adam's fall produced on his poſterity, may be reduced to four ſyſtems. Theſe we ſhall give in our author's own words.

1. "Opinion of Pelagius, adopted by Socinus, that the powers of human nature are not impaired, nor the circumſtances of the human race injured, by the ſin of Adam. 2. Opinion of Arminius, defended by Whitby, *de imputatione peccati Adami*, that death is an evil brought upon the poſterity of Adam by his fault; and that the change upon the condition of the human race, from a life preſerved without end, to mortality, is unfavourable to their moral character. 3. Opinion that human nature is corrupt. *Edwards on Original Sin.* 4. Opinion that the ſin of Adam is imputed to his poſterity. The third and fourth opinions," the learned Principal adds, "taken together, or what have been called the mediate and immediate imputation of the ſin of Adam, form the Calviniſtic view of the effects of it." (Pp. 70, 71.)

Theſe opinions, we believe, are very forcibly ſtated; and the learned Principal, of courſe, adopts the two laſt of them. He does not deny that difficulties attend the ſuppoſition that the ſin of our firſt parents extends to all their offſpring, though difficulties nearly the ſame, he ſays, recur in whatever manner we attempt to account for the origin of evil. But, whatever notions may be entertained with regard to the ſource of that depravity which adheres to human nature, nothing, we conceive, can be more abſurd than the ſentiment of thoſe who have

have taught *that the ſin of Adam is imputed to his poſterity*. That one man may be expoſed to ſuffering and loſs by the fault of another, is eaſily conceived. We ſee inſtances of it, indeed, every day. But that *the ſin of one man ſhould be the ſin of another*, is both a metaphyſical contradiction, and a phyſical impoſſibility. The Goſpel, however, reſts the neceſſity of a remedy on this undeniable propoſition, "that all have ſinned;" and the various denominations of Chriſtians, agreeing in the belief of this propoſition, regard Chriſtianity as the remedy for ſin. But concerning the nature of the remedy they differ; and our author diſtinguiſhes their opinions by the names of the Socinian, the Middle, and the Catholic.

The Socinian ſyſtem, as our author ſays, may be learned from Prieſtley, and is, indeed, at the preſent day, ſufficiently known. Of the middle ſyſtem, which may be learned, he informs us, from Balguy's Eſſay on Redemption, Ben Mordecai's Apology and Price, he gives the ſubjoined account:

"Although God is merciful, a diſtinction ought to be made between the innocent and the penitent. Jeſus, by the merit of his ſufferings, acquired a reward not merely perſonal, but the right of ſaving men from their ſins, and of giving them immortality." John xvii. 2.—Heb. ii. 9, 10.—Acts v. 31.

"This ſyſtem preſerves the contraſt marked, Rom. v. 19. between the firſt and ſecond Adam; exhibits an illuſtrious reward of tranſcendent virtue; and checks preſumption, becauſe penitents receive nothing upon their own account, the ſalvation of the human race being *præmial* to the Redeemer." (Pp. 74, 75.)

This ſyſtem our learned Author allows to be beautiful and pleaſing. But it proceeds, he ſays, on a partial view of facts; by which he ſeems to mean that it does not include the idea of a proper *ſatisfaction* or *atonement*. He adds, that "it involves the Arian opinion concerning the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt." This appears to us to be rather inaccurate. The ſyſtem itſelf has no neceſſary connection with Arianiſm, but only with the Catholic doctrine that our Saviour, as a man, was capable of reward and exaltation. Price, indeed, who maintained this opinion, was an Arian; but there ſurely is no evidence that Balguy was.

Of the Catholic ſyſtem, "ſo called," ſays our author, "becauſe it has been generally held in the Chriſtian world," he gives this general outline, which is juſtly and diſtinctly drawn: "According to the Catholic ſyſtem, the remedy brought by the Goſpel is pardon and eternal life, or a complete redemption from the evils of ſin, obtained and conferred through the mediation of the Lord Jeſus, who, having offered himſelf a ſacrifice for ſin, became the author of eternal ſalvation." (P. 85) Of this ſyſtem the diſtinguiſhing feature is the death of Chriſt as a ſacrifice for ſin; and, therefore, as the learned Principal obſerves, it is incumbent on thoſe who hold the ſyſtem to ſhew that the doctrine of vicarious ſatisfaction, or atonement, is neither

ther irrational nor unjuſt, and that it is the doctrine of Scripture. This, in general, he has very ſatisfactorily done, though he has, we think, incumbered his view of the ſubject, with ſome things which had been better omitted. Thus, for inſtance, he ſays that the doctrine of the atonement is partly ſupported by the value annexed, in the language of Scripture, to the ſufferings of Chriſt. And this value, he adds, "ariſes from the ſeverity of them, taken in conjunction with the innocence and dignity of the ſufferer." This ſeems to us equivalent to ſaying that God could not, conſiſtently with his nature, have pardoned man on eaſier terms: a notion which we are afraid to adopt, becauſe it appears to border on preſumption. No concluſion of reaſon would lead us to decide that God, if he had pleaſed, might not have ſaved the human race without any vicarious ſatisfaction at all. But we think it ſufficiently evident, from Scripture, that this was not the plan adopted by infinite wiſdom. We conceive it, therefore, the ſafeſt way to conſider the method of ſalvation by atonement as *a matter of fact*, concerning which we have no right to ſpeculate, and concerning which all ſpeculations, at leaſt with reſpect to the reaſons of that method, are evidently uſeleſs. In a practical view, undoubtedly, reflection on the innocency and dignity of our Redeemer will always be attended with good effects: for ſuch reflection leads directly to pious ſentiments and to proper conduct.

"Eternal life," ſays the learned Principal, "being the termination of the remedy, the Catholic ſyſtem connects the hope of it with all the previous ſteps; and thus exhibits a completeneſs and conſiſtency, in its account of the nature of the remedy, which are not found in either of the other ſyſtems, or in the fanciful theory publiſhed in the 9th book of Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moſes.*" (P. 84.)

In this place we are ſomewhat at a loſs to comprehend the author's meaning. The theory of Warburton we certainly think, in ſome reſpects, fanciful, particularly in ſending the human race back to *natural religion*, from the fall to the giving of the law. But we do not ſee how this theory fails "in connecting the hope of eternal life with all the previous ſteps." Warburton, very clearly, does not ſuppoſe that men will be ſaved if they neglect the proper qualifications. But we are apt to ſuſpect that by the "Catholic ſyſtem" the learned author here means the Calviniſtic ſyſtem, which connects not *the hope*, but *the aſſurance* of eternal life with the previous ſteps in ſuch a manner that both meaſure and end form one indiſſoluble chain, all the links of which are held together by a ſovereign decree, implying a neceſſity altogether as inevitable as that of the Stoics. This, undoubtedly, was not Warburton's notion; and we hope that the learned lecturer does not conſider it as the notion of thoſe who adopt the Catholic ſyſtem of redemption.

"The queſtion," ſays our author very truly, "concerning univerſal and particular redemption does not imply any difference of opinion as to the ſufficiency of the death of Chriſt, or the number and character

character of thoſe who ſhall finally be ſaved, but reſpects merely the deſtination of the death of Chriſt." (P. 89.) He ſtates, with great fairneſs, the principal topics from which both Calviniſts and Anti-Calviniſts derive their arguments. He then proceeds, in the 5th chapter of this book, to treat of "different ſyſtems of predeſtination," which ariſe, he ſays, "from different conceptions of the divine foreknowledge." Socinus held "that contingent events, ſuch as the determinations of free agents, not being certainly future, are incapable of being the ſubjects of infallible foreknowledge." But this opinion, in our author's apprehenſion, degrades the Supreme Being. Of this, however, we are not thoroughly convinced. It is evident that Socinus thought the certain futurity of an action neceſſary to its being certainly foreſeen, while, at the ſame time, he thought ſuch futurity inconſiſtent with freedom in the agent. With theſe views of the ſubject he was obliged to abandon either the preſcience of God, or the free agency of man. The latter, however, cannot be given up, becauſe we have for it the cleareſt and ſtrongeſt of all evidence, namely, the evidence of conſciouſneſs and feeling. Socinus, therefore, gave up the former. He did not, however, mean to degrade the Deity, when he denied him an attribute which he thought impoſſible. Our Calviniſts, building on the ſame principle as Socinus, that the preſcience of God is incompatible with free choice in man, abandon the latter, and, through the whole of their ſyſtem, repreſent his actions as one continued ſeries of neceſſary effects. They repreſent the Deity, indeed, as free; but neither they nor Socinus ſeem to have reflected that the foreknowledge of God is as ſtrong an argument againſt his own freedom as againſt that of man. For if preſcience of the event deſtroys liberty in the one caſe, it equally deſtroys the ſame liberty in the other. But with regard to man, the conſequences to him are preciſely the ſame, whether we embrace the principles of Calvin or thoſe of the ancient Stoics, and modern philoſophical Neceſſarians. In both ſyſtems man is equally the play-thing of irreſiſtible fate. As far as the honour of the Deity is concerned, the doctrine of Calvin is infinitely the more ſhocking of the two. For, as on the principles of the Neceſſarians, God is ſubject to fate as well as man; his moral character, though it is annihilated, is not blaſphemed. But, on Calvin's principles, the Deity, free himſelf, eſtabliſhes this fate with regard to man, on maxims, to human apprehenſion at leaſt, the moſt arbitrary, cruel, tyrannical, and capricious.

"The materialiſm of Dr. Prieſtley," ſays Dr. Hill, takes away the diſtinction between contingent and neceſſary events." (P. 92.) But this diſtinction, in truth, is equally taken away by the predeſtination of Calvin. In either ſcheme the exiſtence of any contingent events is equally impoſſible. The learned Principal himſelf informs us, that "the characteriſtical feature in the Calviniſtic ſyſtem is the entire dependence of the creature on the Creator, whoſe will is conſidered as the cauſe of every thing that now exiſts, or that is to be." (P. 93.) The reaſoning is afterwards mentioned, though it is not exhibited,

exhibited, by which, he ſays, the Calviniſts ſhew "that every thing which is to exiſt derives its futurition from the decree of God, *and is foreſeen* BECAUSE IT IS DECREED." (P. 97.) If this be the true foundation of preſcience, it appears to us as clear as that two and two make four, that to talk of any events being *contingent*, is the higheſt abſurdity. Yet the learned Principal elſewhere aſſures us, that "the Arminians and Calviniſts agree in this fundamental principle, that contingent events are foreſeen by God." (P. 96.) The Arminians certainly hold this principle; but the Calviniſts cannot conſiſtently hold it unleſs they affix the ſame preciſe idea to the oppoſite terms *contingent* and *neceſſary*. The following is a very fair account of the ſentiments of Arminius with regard to this ſubject.

"He built his ſyſtem of predeſtination upon the divine preſcience thus underſtood: God, foreſeeing the faith and good works of ſome, determined, from all eternity, to give them, upon account of Chriſt, eternal life: Foreſeeing the unbelief and impenitence of others, he determined, from all eternity, to leave them ſubject to condemnation." (Pp. 92, 93.)

The ſyſtem maintained by the learned Principal himſelf is thus farther explained:

"The condition of the human race entered into that one decree which, embracing at once the end and the means, ordained from eternity, with perfect wiſdom, all that was to be. Hence," he adds, "diſputes about the order of the divine decrees, and the controverſy between the Supra-lapſarians and the Sub-lapſarians are inſignificant." (P. 94.)

From this paſſage it appears that the learned Principal is a high Supra-lapſarian Calviniſt, who finds nothing revolting in the doctrine here ſubjoined.

"Diſertis verbis hoc extare negant, decretum fuiſſe a Deo ut ſua defectione periret Adam.—Liberi arbitrii fuiſſe dicunt ut fortunam ipſe ſibi fingeret: Deum vero nihil deſtinaſſe niſi ut pro merito eum tractaret. Tam frigidum commentum ſi recipitur, ubi erit illa Dei Omnipotentia, qua ſecundum arcanum conſilium, quod aliunde non pendet, omnia moderatur? Atqui prædeſtinatio, velint nolint, in poſteris ſe profert.—Unde factum eſt ut tot gentes, una cum liberis eorum infantibus, æternæ morti involveret lapſus Adæ abſque remedio, niſi quia Deo ita viſum eſt? Hic obmuteſcere oportet tam dicaces alioqui linguas. DECRETUM QUIDEM HORRIBILE, FATEOR: inficiari tamen nemo poterit quin præſciverit quem exitum eſſet habiturus homo antequam ipſum conderet, ET IDEO PRÆSCIVERIT QUIA DECRETO SUO SIC ORDINARAT.—Nec abſurdum videri debet quod dico, *Deum non modo primi hominis casum, et in eo posterorum ruinam, prævidisse*, SED ARBITRIO QUOQUE SUO DISPENSASSE.—Non dubitabo igitur cum Auguſtino ſimpliciter fateri, VOLUNTATEM DEI ESSE RERUM NECESSITATEM, atque id *necessario* futurum eſſe quod ille voluerit, quemadmodum ea *vere* futura ſunt quæ præviderit.—LAPSUS EST ENIM PRIMUS HOMO, QUIA DOMINUS ITA EXPEDIRE CENSUERAT: *cur* CENSUERIT, *nos latet*. Certum tamen eſt non aliter cenſuiſſe, niſi quia videbat nominis ſui gloriam inde merito illuſtrari." (Calv. Inſt. L. III. Cap. xxiii. § 7 and 8.)

We

We may certainly be allowed to aſk the learned Principal how his ſyſtem is defended from the impious conſequence of making God the author of ſin. Even his ſuperior abilities, we are confident, muſt neceſſarily ſink under any attempt to ward off the imputation. The learned Principal, however, is a *conſiſtent* Calviniſt; and, in this view, is infinitely more reſpectable than our Engliſh "True Churchmen," who pretend to mutilate the doctrine of their maſter, though the pretence is as eaſily ſeen through as it is diſingenuous. We certainly give the learned Principal credit for adhering to the expreſs declarations of the ſtandards which he has ſubſcribed. But we cannot compliment either his candour or information, when he tells us that "the Calviniſtic doctrine of predeſtination is unfolded in the 3d chapter of the Confeſſion of Faith, *and in the 17th Article of the Church of England.*" (P. 94.) We muſt take the liberty to tell the learned Principal, that the 17th Article of the Church of England is NOT Calviniſtic; and that, on the ſubject of predeſtination, the whole tenor of her articles, of her homilies, and of her liturgy, is in direct contradiction to the blaſphemies of Calvin. Had Dr. Hill been better acquainted with our forms, he might have eaſily been perſuaded of the truth of our aſſertion. He himſelf informs us that "Calviniſts conſider the decree of reprobation, including two acts, preterition and condemnation, as abſolute." (P. 95.) Now the moſt curſory view of our 17th article muſt convince Dr. Hill that reprobation, an eſſential tenet of Calviniſm, is not even alluded to in that article; and what is more, the truth of it is never once ſuppoſed in any part of the formularies of the Church of England. In theſe formularies Dr. Hill will find nothing analogous to the dogmatical language of the Confeſſion of Faith, of which we here preſent a ſpecimen to our readers.

"By the decree of God, for the manifeſtation of his glory, ſome men and angels are predeſtinated unto everlaſting life, and others fore-ordained to everlaſting death.

"Theſe angels and men, thus predeſtinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably deſigned; and their number is ſo certain and definite, that it cannot be either increaſed or diminiſhed.

"The reſt of mankind, God was pleaſed, according to the unſearchable counſel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaſeth, for the glory of his ſovereign power over his creatures, to paſs by, and to ordain them to diſhonour and wrath for their ſin, to the praiſe of his glorious juſtice." (Conf. of Faith, Cap. III. § 3, 4, and 7.)

By turning to p. 357, of our XVIIIth Volume, our readers will perceive how completely this language harmonizes with the firſt, third, and fourth of the Lambeth Articles, to obtain the ratification of which the learned Principal will again recollect how earneſtly the Engliſh Calviniſts laboured for more than half a century. And their zeal, he muſt own, furniſhes an invincible proof that they did not conceive the ſtandards of our Church to be already Calviniſtic.

In

In ſpeaking of "the application of the remedy," (Chap. VIII.) Dr. Hill thus expreſſes the ſentiments of his party.

"Calviniſts conſider the grace connected with ſalvation as confined to thoſe whom God hath choſen; as a ſupernatural influence exerted by the Creator upon the faculties of the human mind, which, deriving its efficacy from the power of God fulfilling his purpoſe, can never fail of its effect; and which produces, in a manner that they do not pretend to explain, but ordinarily with the uſe of means, *and always in a conſiſtency with the reaſonable nature of man,* that change which is the work of the Spirit." (P. 99.)

Here, our readers will obſerve, we have the doctrine of *invincible grace* avowed in terms as explicit as poſſible. But were we to inquire of the learned Principal how the operation of invincible grace is conſiſtent with the reaſonable nature of man, we ſhould not expect a very ſatisfactory anſwer. The fact is, that they are totally irreconcileable: and, accordingly, we have the honour to aſſure our author that *invincible grace* has no place in the Creed of the Church of England. The ſame we affirm with regard to what follows: "This grace does not preſerve any man in this ſtate from every kind of ſin; *but thoſe to whom it is given cannot fall from it either finally or totally.*" This is preciſely the fifth of the Lambeth Articles. But how abhorrent it is from the doctrine of our Church may be ſeen Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. XV. Pp. 279, 280.

In the next chapter the learned author contraſts the difficulties which adhere to the Arminian and Calviniſtic ſyſtems, in reſpect to the extent and application of the remedy. The firſt ſyſtem, he allows, "appears, upon a general view, moſt ſatisfying to a pious and benevolent mind." This conceſſion does equal honour to him who makes it, and to the doctrine in favour of which it is made. But that doctrine, the learned Principal conceives, labours under three difficulties.

"1. The ſuppoſition of an adminiſtration of the means of grace ſufficient to bring all men to ſalvation, upon which this ſyſtem proceeds, appears to be contradicted by fact. 2. This ſyſtem, while in words it aſcribes all to the grace of God, does, in effect, reſolve our ſalvation into ſomething independent of that grace. 3. That failure in the purpoſe of the Almighty, which this ſyſtem ſeems to imply, is not eaſily reconciled with our notions of his ſovereignty." (Pp. 109, 110.)

Theſe difficulties of the learned Profeſſor appear to us as no difficulties at all. With reſpect to the firſt, he ſeems to think, that if ſufficient grace were afforded to all men, all men ought to be neceſſarily ſaved. But are we warranted, either by theory or by fact, to conclude that no free agent will neglect or abuſe the means which are put in his power to advance his own happineſs? With reſpect to the ſecond, Arminians certainly reſolve our ſalvation, in conformity to Scripture, partly into our own endeavours. But the learned Principal is very ill informed if he think that they conſider theſe endeavours as *ſomething independent of the grace of God.* On the contrary, they, not

not only in words, but in fact, aſcribe our power to uſe any endeavours, to the free, unmerited bounty of God. And with reſpect to the laſt, they totally deny that their ſyſtem implies a failure of the purpoſe of the Almighty. The fact is, that Calviniſts firſt chalk out a plan for Almighty God, and then cry out that, on the Arminian ſcheme, this plan muſt miſcarry. But it does not follow that, therefore, the plan of God muſt miſcarry. Beſides, Arminians ſee no inconſiſtency in their ſcheme with the ſovereignty of God. Is the dignity of a ſovereign impeached by ſuppoſing that his ſubjects may be other than ſlaves? The people of this country, at leaſt, have long been of opinion, that the only legitimate and rightful ſovereign is he who rules over ſubjects that are free.

The objections to the Calviniſtic ſyſtem, our author ſays, may be reduced to two: 1. "It is conceived to be inconſiſtent with the nature of man, as a free moral agent. 2. It is conceived to repreſent the Almighty in a light inconſiſtent with his moral attributes; as partial, unjuſt, inſincere." (Pp. 101, 102.) Theſe objections, of courſe, the learned Principal undertakes to remove. The attempt is conducted with much apparent metaphyſical acuteneſs, in our judgment, without any degree of ſucceſs.

The firſt objection, he ſays, proceeds on that definition of liberty, illuſtrated by Whitby, Clarke, and King, by which it is called "Liberty of indifference," or the "ſelf-determining power." But this objection vaniſhes, he adds, when we adopt the definition of Edwards and Locke, "the power of acting according to choice." But what do we gain by this definition, if our *choice* itſelf be, according to this ſyſtem, the effect of *neceſſity?* The learned Principal, indeed, both here and elſewhere, confounds the doctrine of Calvin with that of the philoſophical Neceſſarians. But the two doctrines, though, as we have ſaid, their conſequences with regard to man are preciſely the ſame, are yet diſtinguiſhed by a clear line of difference. Both annihilate all liberty of choice; but the neceſſity of the philoſophers ariſes from the nature of things, while that of Calvin is produced by the immediate act of God. On this ſubject Calvin perpetually expreſſes himſelf in terms, of which the ſenſe is ſo clear, that it can neither be evaded nor explained away. The following paſſage is full to our purpoſe. We have quoted it on former occaſions; but it cannot be quoted or urged too often. "*Ac voluntatem movet, non qualiter multis ſeculis traditum eſt et creditum,* UT NOSTRÆ POSTEA SIT ELECTIONIS MOTIONI AUT OBTEMPERARE AUT REFRAGARI, *ſed illam* EFFICACITER AFFICIENDO. Illud ergo toties a Chryſoſtomo repetitum neceſſe eſt, *quem trahit volentem trahit.*" (Inſt. II. 3. 10.) No ſtronger words than theſe can be employed to exclude all idea of *freedom of choice.* Nay, Calvin held that, in the work of converſion, God not only *influences*, but actually *aboliſhes* the human will, and ſubſtitutes another will in its place. For, commenting on Ezek. xxxvi. 26. theſe are his words: "Si ergo lapis in carnem transformatur quando nos Deus ad recti ſtudium convertit; ABOLETUR QUICQUID EST PROPRIÆ NOSTRÆ

NOSTRÆ VOLUNTATIS: QUOD IN EJUS LOCUM SUCCEDIT, TOTUM A DEO EST." This is followed, indeed, by a metaphysical distinction, which is, however, of no value. "Voluntatem dico aboleri, non quatenus est voluntas; quia in hominis conversione integrum manet quod primæ est naturæ: creari autem novam dico, non ut voluntas esse incipiat, sed vertatur ex mala in bonam. HOC IN SOLIDUM A DEO FIERI AFFIRMO." (Inst. II. 3. 6.)

It appears, then, with evidence the most complete, that Calvin allows *of no liberty of choice,* and that consequently, the attempt is hopeless to reconcile his system with "the nature of man as a free moral agent." Accordingly, it will not fail to be observed, that the learned Principal has not even attempted to remove this insurmountable objection. Instead of shewing us how *Calvinism* is consistent with human liberty, he has carried us away altogether from Calvinism, and directed our attention to the principles of what is called *philosophical necessity*, which, though a system equally hostile to liberty, is yet a system totally distinct, but the more comfortable and satisfactory of the two. At all events, the two assertions with which the learned Principal concludes his answer to this objection, are worse than gratuitous: "By this efficacy, the Almighty *infallibly directs the conduct of the elect*; *and they attain the liberty of a moral agent.*"

The second of the above two objections is, if possible, still more formidable than the first. Calvinism certainly represents God as *partial*, since his favours are capriciously bestowed, without any reason but his simple pleasure. It represents him as *unjust*, since he first predestinates men to wickedness (or *prepares* them for misery) and then damns them for that wickedness. It represents him as *insincere*, since he directs his precepts, his promises, his exhortations, and his threatenings, equally to the reprobate as to the elect, though in consequence of his agency, as well as of his eternal decree, the former are totally incapable of being profited by them. All these impious and horrid blasphemies Calvin constantly and loudly maintains. We could easily produce almost innumerable proofs; but those of our readers who have attended to our former examinations, at various times, of the Calvinistic doctrines, are already acquainted with many of these proofs; and by looking into Calvin's works they will find many more. In short, the God of Calvin is equally destitute of justice, of goodness, of veracity, and of mercy.

But let us hear the reasoning of the learned Principal in reply to this objection: "The Almighty," he says, "distributes his favours according to his pleasure: and the grace by which any are saved proceeds from compassion, an exercise of goodness to which none can claim a right." (P. 104.) He who acquiesces in an argument like this, must be easily satisfied. By the irreversible decree of God, the whole human race are sunk into a state which inevitably subjects them to eternal damnation; they are all in themselves on an equal footing, all equally objects of pity and compassion. Of the millions reduced to this state by himself, it pleases God to save a small num-

ber, and leaves all the reſt to their terrible fate. And this is repreſented as a proof of *goodneſs!* If the learned Profeſſor had to deſcribe *a man* whoſe conduct was governed by ſuch a principle, he would think that that man could not poſſibly be painted in colours too black, and would hold up his character to public execration. Yet ſuch a being preciſely (with horror we ſpeak it!) is the God of Calvin!

What follows excited our higheſt aſtoniſhment. "The decree of reprobation does not exert any influence upon the minds of men, leading them to ſin: the neceſſity of ſinning is not phyſical, which frees from all blame; but moral, which implies the higheſt degree of blame." (P. 104.) With regard to the firſt aſſertion in this paſſage, the language is ambiguous: but if the *decree* of reprobation *itſelf* does not lead men to ſin, the *execution* of it does, and does ſo inevitably. For firſt, all men, in conſequence of the fall (which was alſo decreed) are, according to Calvin, naturally under a *neceſſity of ſinning*. (Inſt. II. 4. 1.) From this neceſſity the elect are delivered by invincible grace. But the reprobate, beſide remaining under their natural neceſſity of ſinning, are CAREFULLY AND INDUSTRIOUSLY PREPARED for that damnation to which by the decree of reprobation they are adjudged. Not only is the neceſſary grace withheld from them, but the very *means* of grace are converted to their ruin. That we are not here miſrepreſenting Calvin, our learned readers will be fully convinced by conſulting the extracts quoted from the Inſtitutes, at p. 19, of our XIXth Volume. To theſe we ſhall here add only the following, which is equally explicit and luminous with any of them. "Verbum idem dum reprobis deſtinat, *etſi non in eorum correctionem, in alium tamen uſum valere facit*; quo *et in præſens conſcientiæ teſtimonio urgeantur*, ET IN JUDICII DIEM MAGIS REDDANTUR INEXCUSABILES." (Inſt. II. 5. 5.) Thus theſe miſerable wretches are firſt, by the eternal decree of God, placed in a ſituation in which they cannot help themſelves. An offer of aſſiſtance is then held out to them; but it is only in mockery: for no aſſiſtance is really deſigned them. And laſtly, at the day of judgment, they are upbraided and condemned as inexcuſable, becauſe they neglected to avail themſelves of the offer. Does the learned Principal, in good earneſt, conceive ſuch a conduct as this to be quite conſiſtent with *the moral attributes of God?*

With reſpect to the ſecond of the Principal's aſſertions, "that the neceſſity of ſinning is not phyſical but moral," we have here again to contend, not with the Calviniſt, but with the philoſophical Neceſſarian. But on this point it is ſuperfluous to enlarge. It is perfectly ſufficient to remind our readers, that on Calvin's principles, with which alone we are at preſent concerned, *neceſſity of ſinning* ariſes from *the poſitive decree of God*. It is, therefore, of not the ſmalleſt conſequence, whether this neceſſity be phyſical or moral, conſidered with reſpect to the nature of man. It ultimately flows from a phyſical cauſe; the will, appointment, or agency of God. The philoſophical Neceſſarian, therefore, would effectually bar every plea for remonſtrance, cenſure,

or

or complaint, if he could prove his principle, that in the ſyſtem of the univerſe, nothing could poſſibly have been otherwiſe than it is. But the Calviniſt, while he diſclaims that principle, places mankind under the government of a being whoſe character is the object of horror and of deteſtation.

"If we aſk," ſays the learned Principal," why God gave only to ſome that grace which, although not bound to give to any, he might have given to all, we recur to the antient queſtion concerning the origin of evil." His own ſolution of the queſtion is this, "that although we cannot explain how evil is ſubſervient to good in the general ſyſtem, we infer from the exiſtence of the world, that it was not unworthy of God to produce a world ſuch as this." And he adds, that "this philoſophical anſwer to the queſtion concerning the origin of evil, is the anſwer to the ſecond objection againſt the Calviniſtic ſyſtem." But the learned author appears to us to be in a miſtake. The Calviniſtic ſyſtem, not content with the evil actually in the world, creates an evil infinite in extent and endleſs in duration, for which it aſſigns no other reaſon but an arbitrary, cruel, and capricious decree. "The evil that is in the univerſe is permitted," Dr. Hill affirms, "to exiſt upon account of its connection with the good." (P. 106.) We can eaſily ſee that good may ariſe from the puniſhment of incorrigibly wicked offenders who had power to act otherwiſe. But we cannot ſee what good effects can be produced from condemning to a ſtate of eternal miſery, innumerable rational creatures, created expreſsly for the purpoſe of being damned; and who, therefore, never had the means of eſcaping damnation. Calvin's doctrine is clear: "*Impios fuiſſe* DESTINATO CREATOS UT PERIRENT." (On Rom. ix. 18.) and "*excæcari*, NON EOS QUI SUA MALITIA ID MERITI SUNT, SED QUI ANTE MUNDI CREATIONEM REPROBATI SUNT A DEO." (On Rom. xi. 7.) The damnation of his reprobate is, therefore, purely gratuitous; for they never were in a ſtate of probation. It is entirely reſolved into the good pleaſure or glory of God. Dr. Hill ſays, indeed, that "Arminians are obliged to have recourſe to the ſame anſwer," to account for the acknowledged inequality in the gifts both of nature and of grace. But the difference is immenſe: for Arminians hold that a ſufficiency of grace is conferred on every man; and that the damnation of any is owing to the abuſe of it. This fully vindicates the moral character of God, which, on the principles of Calvin, can never be vindicated. Dr. Hill, we obſerve, explains to his pupils what Calviniſts mean by *the glory of God*; we wiſh that he had inſerted the explanation. But as this is not the caſe, we earneſtly recommend to our readers a ſermon of Archbiſhop Sharpe on the ſubject, of which the text is, 1 Cor. x. 31. The diſcourſes of this excellent divine are, indeed, ineſtimable.

(To be concluded in our next.)

The Correſpondence of the late J. Wilkes with his Friends: Printed from the original MSS.; in which are introduced Memoirs of his Life. By John Almon. 8vo. 5 Vols. Phillips. 1805.

Letters from the Year 1774 *to* 1796 *of J. Wilkes, Eſq. addreſſed to his Daughter, the late Miſs Wilkes: With a Collection of his miſcellaneous Poems. To which is prefixed a Memoir of the Life of Mr. Wilkes.* 12mo. 4 Vols. Longman and Co. Hatchard, London. Conſtable and Co. Edinburgh. 1804.

"LEAVE me, leave me to repoſe!" was the repeated anſwer of the northern propheteſs to Odin, when he preſſed her to reveal what ſhe wiſhed not to diſcover. We are much miſtaken, could the ſubject of the publications now before us ſpeak from the manſions of the dead, if he would not moſt heartily join in this reiterated reſponſe of the "mother of the giant-brood." But he would call in vain—to book-makers and bookſellers nothing is ſacred, not even the aſhes of the dead. Yet, though he might with the utmoſt propriety intreat his biographers to leave him to repoſe, he could not, either with propriety or truth, reproach them, as Horace's madman did *his* friends, with "*Pol! me occidiſtis amici*;" for, long before the publication of theſe nine volumes, to the thinking world there was nothing *equivocal* in the character of J. Wilkes, Eſq. If not *fair*, it was at leaſt *clear* and *decided*. We have the pleaſure therefore of announcing to the preſent editors and biographers that they have done him little harm. Their work will be hardly more injurious to his memory than Falſtaff's ſword to the carcaſe of Hotſpur. This however is all the conſolation we can beſtow: it will not, we are afraid, make up for what truth compels us to ſubjoin, that their nine volumes either contain only things already known to the public, or what is not merely unimportant, but frivolous.

The anonymous editor of the letters of J. Wilkes, Eſq. from 1774 to 1796, who is alſo the writer of the Memoir prefixed to theſe letters, appears to be not quite a *volunteer*, but to have been ſomehow preſſed into the ſervice, from what motives we will not pretend to determine. He does his duty however in a ſoldier-like manner. To drop the metaphor, the Memoir prefixed to the four volumes, is well written: the writer ſays with ingenuity, and for the moſt part with moderation, all that could be ſaid on the ſubject; but appears to feel that it is "*Labor improbus*," that he is endeavouring to waſh the blackamoor white. We could often make wild work with the concluſions from his premiſes, were we to enter into an examination of them; but the ſentiments and conduct of Mr. Wilkes, which we ſhall lay before our readers (as exhibited in theſe letters, and Mr. Almon's volumes) ſpare us every trouble of the kind. They ſpeak more forcibly than a thouſand arguments.

Mr. Almon, the editor of the five volumes, is of talents more tranſcendent.

tranſcendent. He is no puling and unwilling conſcript, but a tried and hardy veteran. He daſhes through thick and thin. He narrates all the deviations (we are miſtaken, he does *not* narrate *all*) of his hero from the rule of right, whether in politics or morals; yet, at the ſame time, holds him up as a political paragon, and as ſo pure a moraliſt, as ſo much alive to all the decencies and delicacies of female conduct, to the τὸ καλὸν of womanhood, as to have been moſt peculiarly fitted for—A YOUNG "LADY'S PRECEPTOR!" On finiſhing this ſentence, we had our fears that we had expreſſed ourſelves too ſtrongly; hardly conceiving it poſſible that even Mr. A. could have riſked ſo prepoſterous a ſentiment. We therefore turned again to his work, and found that our only failure was in having given his ſentiment with all the feebleneſs of a copyiſt. We take ſhame to ourſelves for having fallen ſo very far ſhort of his original energy; and, to make the beſt amends we can, we treat the public with his own words, "Mr. Wilkes was, perhaps, *the beſt lady's preceptor ever known.*" (Vol. V. p. 286.) With all the humility which conviction of inferiority produces, we beg leave to point out to our readers how far Mr. A. goes beyond us. We had repreſented him as *only* ſaying that Mr. W. was peculiarly fitted for a young lady's preceptor; whereas it appears, to our confuſion, that he had ſaid that Mr. W. was not only the beſt *fitted for* a lady's preceptor, but *actually* "the beſt lady's preceptor ever known." Once more we humble ourſelves before Mr. A. for having given ſo cold and emaſculated a copy of his very warm and vigorous ideas. We know not whether Mr. A. be a married man, neither can we tell whether he have daughters, either in the dull matrimonial way, or in the more liberal and friſky *à la Wilkes faſhion*; in which latter mode Mr. A. and the patriot's anonymous biographer, inform us that the pious endeavours of the patriot and *lady's preceptor* were rewarded with ſucceſs: but we moſt ſincerely, moſt *devoutly* (even ſhould Mr. A. be ſcandaliſed at the *latter* term) wiſh and hope that none of his female plants, whether of the *garden* ſpecies, or of the *wilder* varieties, were ever placed (even during his moſt violent paroxyſm of Wilkite adoration) under the parent wing of John Wilkes, Eſq. *his* heaven-born LADY'S PRECEPTOR.

But, paſſing from generals, let us dip a little into the private, and public life of Mr. Wilkes, as given to the world by Mr. A. Without going farther back, we are told that his father was an eminent diſtiller in St. John's-ſquare, Clerkenwell, who "lived in a ſplendid ſtyle, and kept a very elegant and ſumptuous table for all his friends;" he, moreover, always drove his "*coach and ſix*, ſuch was his love of external appearance;" and he, finally, did from time to time communicate the bleſſing of this coach and ſix to a "Mr. Mead, an eminent dry-ſalter on London-bridge." Mrs. Wilkes, our hero's mother, was a Diſſenter; Mead, with his wife and daughter (afterwards Mrs. Wilkes) were alſo Diſſenters; and Mr. Wilkes, though profeſſing to be of the eſtabliſhed Church, yet, like the Jews

of old, inſtead of worſhipping at Jeruſalem, went ſometimes to the *diſſenting high-places*: and ſo we find that the diſtiller's coach and ſix "frequently" conveyed the dry-ſalter and family, as well as himſelf and family, to the meeting-houſe in Southwood-lane, at Highgate.

The ſubject of the preſent volumes was the favourite ſon of this diſtiller, who was ſo fond of *external appearance*. The aberrations of the ſon from moral rectitude, ſeem to have been derived from a double portion of this fondneſs. To be conſpicuous in gay and diſſolute ſociety; to be ſpoken of as a diſtinguiſhed public character, were his chief objects at his outſet in life. Theſe he always kept in view, as the means, after he had ſpent a large fortune, of obtaining wherewithal to indulge his appetites, and ſatisfy his paſſion for external appearance; for he was not a patriot of the Andrew Marvel ſtamp, who could dine on cold ſhoulder of mutton, and live in a garret. His firſt ſtep in life ſtrongly marked this unbounded propenſity of trying to acquire at any rate the means of what he thought alone merited the name of enjoyment; we mean the indulgence of every luxurious appetite. He married at twenty-two a woman of thirty-two, a rigid Diſſenter, educated in a narrow circle, a perſon who, he muſt have been convinced, at the time he led her to the altar, was for him a moſt unfit mate. In fact he married not the woman, but a large fortune; as he himſelf tells us fairly in one of his letters, "It was a ſacrifice to Plutus, not to Venus. I ſtumbled at the very threſhold of the temple of Hymen:

> "The God of Love was not a bidden gueſt,
> Nor preſent at his own myſterious feaſt."

Having *thus* obtained "a large fortune," he made haſte to enjoy it in *his* ſenſe of enjoyment. A ſplendid houſe was hired in a faſhionable ſituation, and Mr. Wilkes ruſhed into every ſpecies of expenſe and diſſipation; and without the ſmalleſt attention to a wife of ſtrict principles, of delicacy and ſenſibility, daily filled his table with "gay bacchanalians, of diſſolute manners, and vulgar language," (Vol. I. p. 18.) who were "often coarſe, and *almoſt* obſcene:" (Ibid. p. 19.) had he ſaid *altogether* and *groſsly* ſo, he would not have gone beyond the truth. Againſt this conduct Mrs. Wilkes remonſtrated, but remonſtrated in vain; Mr. W. could not be brought to ſtop in his career of diſſipation, and a ſeparation took place. The ſeparate maintenance allowed to the lady by her *generous* huſband (though by his own confeſſion ſhe had brought him a large fortune, and though his own, by the ſame confeſſion, was "alſo that of a gentleman") was only 200l. per annum. Small as this annuity was, he afterwards endeavoured to deprive her of it; firſt, by every gentle and inſinuating art; and when theſe failed, by proceſs of law. In both ways he was defeated, and forced to ſit down at the ſame time with diſappointment and diſgrace.

Againſt a report which Mr. A. ſays was circulated at the time of the ſeparation, he vigorouſly defends his hero. "An opinion," he ſays,

ſays, "has been circulated that *religion* was the firſt cauſe of the diſagreement between Mr. and Mrs. Wilkes." (Vol I. p. 20.) This he proves could not be true. 1ſt. "Becauſe he was not a likely man to quarrel with a lady on the ſcore of religion." (Ibid.) 2dly. Becauſe "they frequently went to meeting together." (Ibid.) 3dly. Becauſe, "at Ayleſbury, he generally went to church twice a day." (Ibid.) 4thly. Becauſe "he ſubſcribed annually for many years twelve guineas to ſupport the civil and religious rights of the Diſſenters." (Ibid.) "Theſe facts," he triumphantly adds, "do not evince any bigoted, or obſtinate *tenacity* concerning religion." (Ibid.) But Mr. A. might have ſpared all this accumulation of proof, as we may venture to aſſert without the riſk of a denial, that among all the foibles, faults, and crimes of this buſtling demagogue, a *tenacity* concerning religion was never mentioned. Had Mrs. Wilkes been a Mahometan, or a Hindoo, or a Guebre, or an adorer of the excrementious divinity of Thibet, J. Wilkes, with the religious, or irreligious verſatility of the Corſican emperor of the French, would have accompanied her to *her* place of worſhip, and changed his belief, or no belief, as often as ſhe pleaſed; provided always that the good woman had been diſpoſed quietly to behold her fortune rapidly melt away; to wink at a little drunkenneſs, and to liſten quietly to daily blaſphemy and obſcenity at her table. This the unreaſonable woman was not diſpoſed to do, and ſo, after all Mr. A.'s proofs to the contrary, we muſt beg leave to think that *religion* on the ſide of the wife, and irreligion on that of the huſband, were the great cauſes of diſagreement.

Let us now turn to Mr. W.'s firſt ſtep in *public* life, as given by his friend and biographer Mr. A. He was perſuaded by his bottle companions that he had great parliamentary talents; of this it was no hard matter to perſuade a man who throughout life ſeems to have appreciated himſelf at leaſt at his full value. Following their advice, and in ſpite of the remonſtrances of his father, his mother-in-law, his wife, and all his real friends, he became a candidate for the town of Berwick, where he had no *natural* intereſt, and where his ſucceſs, of courſe, depended *ſolely* on his *purſe*. His addreſs to the electors of Berwick, which he, and his kind friends have preſerved, diſplays that groſs, and unbluſhing impudence of *his* patriotic aſſertion invariably adhered to by him during his political warfare, to which his conduct, and his motives of action (which laſt he could not always conceal, and which indeed, among friends, he did not wiſh or endeavour to conceal) conſtantly gave the lie. As illuſtrating his political character, we lay it before our readers.

"Gentlemen, I beg leave to offer myſelf a candidate to repreſent you in Parliament. I came here with the utmoſt pleaſure, to make you a tender of my ſervices, from the aſſurances I had received of your ſteady attachment to the cauſe of liberty. I early embarked in the ſame generous cauſe, and have always had it neareſt to my heart.

"I am thoroughly ſenſible of the excellence of the conſtitution of this

happy country, and my utmoſt efforts ſhall be exerted for the preſervation of it. In this, and in every other caſe, I hope to be your faithful repreſentative; and while I am delivering your ſentiments, and diſcharging my duty to my conſtituents, I ſhall have the ſatisfaction of ſerving a cauſe which I have valued beyond every thing.

"If I am ſo happy as to ſucceed, I aſſure you, gentlemen, I ſhall ever be watchful over the intereſts of this nation in general; and the good of this corporation ſhall have my particular attention. It ſhall always be my favourite ſtudy. My warmeſt endeavours ſhall be employed for you, and I ſhall eſteem myſelf happy in every opportunity of doing you a real ſervice.

"Gentlemen, I come here *uncorrupting*, and I promiſe you I ſhall ever be *uncorrupted*. As I never will take a bribe, ſo I will never offer one. I ſhould think myſelf totally unworthy of the great and important truſt I am now ſoliciting, if I ſought to obtain it by the violation of the laws of my country. I hold them to be ſacred; and I think the happineſs and ſecurity of every man depends on the obſervance of them.

"Gentlemen, I have no private views: my ſole ambition is to ſerve my country, and to contribute to the preſervation of the invaluable privileges which this nation enjoys beyond any other in the world. I ſhall act ſteadily on theſe principles; and therefore I hope for the honour of your protection and encouragement, and ſhall endeavour to convince you of my ſincereſt regards, and warmeſt gratitude."

Two paſſages in this ſpeech are very conſpicuous: "Gentlemen, I come here *uncorrupting*, and I promiſe you I ſhall ever be *uncorrupted*. As I never will *take a bribe*, ſo I will never *offer one!*—Gentlemen, I have no *private* views, my ſole ambition is to ſerve my country!" With regard to the *truth* of the orator when ſpeaking of bribery, his friend and biographer Mr. A. and not we, ſhall ſpeak; "notwithſtanding Mr. W.'s fine ſpeech about virtue and patriotiſm, this experiment coſt him between 3 and 4000l." (Vol. I. p. 27.) As to his *patriotic motives* to ſerve his country, we ſhall have an opportunity as we proceed to examine their purity.

Diſappointed at Berwick, he was more ſucceſsful at Ayleſbury; but, as Mr. A. informs us, at the expenſe of "upwards of 7000l." Theſe bleedings of the purſe, all for the ſake of his dear country! led him to have dealings with the Jews; and, as "*facilis eſt deſcenſus averni*," to have ſoon afterwards dealings with the devil, who no doubt at this time ſuggeſted to him the attempt of robbing his wife of the pittance of an annuity which had been granted to her on their ſeparation. The caſe in Burrows' Reports, which Wilkes's *friendly* biographer cites at length (Vol. I. Pp. 36, 37.) records the infamous tranſaction, and his legal and merited defeat.

Another Ayleſbury election, and his "ſtyle of living," we are told, "obliged him to think ſeriouſly of obtaining ſome public ſituation." The embaſſy to Conſtantinople, and the government of Canada, were, at different times, objects of his ambition, in both of theſe he was diſappointed. Nothing now remained for him but *oppoſition*, that refuge of diſappointment and diſcontent. He became a

writer againſt miniſtry, and managed the controverſy with conſiderable vivacity, but with much coarſe and acrimonious perſonalities. This is not the place to enter into the affair of general warrants, of Wilkes's expulſion from the Houſe of Commons, outlawry &c. It is enough to ſay that the preſent biographer confirms what very few doubted of before, viz. the *inſincerity* of Wilkes's patriotiſm. Amidſt his loudeſt cries for liberty, and exclamations againſt miniſtry, he was ever ready to make peace with any miniſtry on certain conditions. In 1764 he ſays, in a letter to Mr. Cotes, "If they (the miniſtry) would ſend me ambaſſador to Conſtantinople, *it is all I ſhould wiſh.*" (Vol. I. p. 62.) In the ſame letter he adds, "If I ſtay in Paris" (i. e. if I am neglected by miniſtry) "I will not be forgot in England; for I will feed the papers from time to time with gall and vinegar againſt the adminiſtration." (Vol. II. p. 54.) In another letter to the ſame perſon in 1765, he writes, "I have never yet heard who the preſent miniſtry are: I believe the *Scot* is the breath of their noſtrils. It depends however upon them whether Mr. Wilkes is their friend or their enemy. If he ſtarts as the latter, he will laſh them with ſcorpion rods, and they are already prepared: I wiſh however that we may be friends; and I had rather follow the plan that I marked out in my letter from Geneva *." (Vol. II. p. 214.) Here our worthy patriot is ready to be friends with miniſtry, even ſhould they be the creatures of Bute, provided they will make him an ambaſſador; but if they will not, though he profeſſes to know nothing of them or of their meaſures, though they may be honeſt men, and their meaſures advantageous to the country, yet he vows he will laſh them with ſcorpion rods! Of ſuch rotten ſtuff in general is formed the gariſh cloke of patriotiſm: but "Falsò et inſidiosè *libertatis* nomen obtenditur ab iis, qui *privatim degeneres*, in *publicum exitioſi*, nihil ſpei niſi per *diſcordias* habent." That Mr. Wilkes was a patriot of this ſtamp we think, from what we have already ſaid, is ſufficiently evident. We ſhall produce ſome farther proofs from both his biographers. The anonymous biographer informs us, (Vol. I. Pp. 21, 22.) "That there is no doubt that Mr. W. when colonel of the Buckinghamſhire militia, made a frank acknowledgment of his reſolution to take advantage of the times, and make his fortune;" he accordingly "put in his ſickle, and crowned his toil with plenty beyond expectation." With this determination, and before he had crowned his toil with plenty, with him the whole of government was a blot, and nothing could be diſcovered in its meaſures but imbecillity, injuſtice and oppreſſion. But when plenty had crowned his labours, when clothed in the alderman's gown, when poſſeſſed of a lucrative place, when veniſon, pipers and dories, French pies, and French game of all ſorts decked his board, the *very ſame* government is by him tranſubſtan-

* He means rather go ambaſſador to Conſtantinople.

tiated

tiated into all that is parental, wife, and great. For the truth of this ſtatement let us hearken to the patriot himſelf. When *poor*, J. Wilkes thus deſcribes the ſtate of his country.

" The public ſecurities of this kingdom have fallen ſo low, that foreign nations begin to loſe all opinion of that credit on whoſe broad baſis our commerce aroſe, and increaſed to a magnitude, which has raiſed the admiration and envy of all other ſtates. The public funds in a very few months, in this early dawning of peace, have fallen above fourteen per cent. England appears now in danger of ceaſing to be the great mart, the centre, of the commerce and riches of the world, from the fluctuating ſtate of her public credit. That beautiful and wondrous fabric, the work of ages, the pride and glory of Britain, as well as the jealouſy of her moſt powerful neighbours, which has ſurvived two deſperate Scottiſh rebellions, ſeems at laſt doomed to fall a ſacrifice to the incapacity and treachery of a ſet of men, formerly the objects of the contempt and ridicule, now of the abhorrence and hatred of their country."

When he had obtained that *wealth* which enabled him fully to enjoy his appetites and paſſions, J. Wilkes thus chaunts the praiſes of that government which he had condemned and execrated.

" I am particularly attached to the houſe of Brunſwick. The laſt eighty years have been the happieſt and moſt proſperous in our annals: during that period the Brunſwick family has been on the throne. We are governed by wiſe and equal laws; the ſame laws for the poor as for the rich, for every ſubject of the ſtate. Our perſons are ſafe, our property ſecure, and our commerce moſt extenſively flouriſhing; eſpecially during the reign of his preſent majeſty."

Than this never did any *would be* patriot blow more decidedly hot and cold.

We come now to ſpeak of the preſent publications in a literary view. Do they convey any new information of the ſmalleſt importance, or what are their merits as works of mere amuſement? The four volumes of the anonymous Editor profeſs not to reveal any thing new. Beſide the Memoir, which precedes the Letters, they contain only the chit-chat correſpondence of the father and daughter; of which correſpondence it may be truly ſaid that although *every* alderman, and *every* alderman's daughter could not have written ſo well, yet that, without performing a miracle, even *ſome* aldermen, and *ſome* aldermen's daughters might have written much better; and we truſt we may venture to aſſert, that no one of the members of the honourable court would, in letters to his daughter, have gloried in his irreligion, as the quondam member of the Joiners company has done.

We give a few extracts, as we open the volumes at hazard, to confirm what we have ſaid. And firſt, as a ſpecimen of futility and impiety:

" *Sunday, Jan.* 10, 1779.

" I beg the favour of you, my dear Polly, to order Francis to put the ſix letters in the poſt, by which I ſhall be ſure of not being diſappointed next Saturday

Saturday and Sunday. The queen's birth-day being to be kept on the Monday makes this precaution neceſſary.

"The memorial of the twelve admirals ſeems to be perfectly abſurd, although I hear it much commended. Lord Kelly and Mr. Drax only are of my opinion. I whiſpered Lord Kelly, who is not a ſtrict believer, that I thought the twelve admirals as great fools as the twelve ————, and as bad writers.

"Be ſo good to order me giblet-ſoup and pork griſkins for my Sunday's dinner, at five; but I make a point that my dear Polly does not wait dinner for me, as every thing is ſo uncertain with travellers, and I hear the roads are very heavy. I mean to lie at Marlborough on Saturday, and to leave it on Sunday at day-break; and yet poſſibly I may not be able to reach Prince's Court before ſeven or eight at night. I wiſh for a good fire in my bed-chamber *only*; but pleaſe to give orders to have the chimney ſwept in my cabinet, which I believe has not been done for a twelvemonth.

"Governor Johnſtone's favourite is here for her health.

"*Bon ſoir, ma chere fille.*"

Secondly, We have a ſpecimen of the proper direction he had given to the ſtudies of his daughter, and how well he had made her acquainted with the *Puceſle* of Voltaire, as appears from his ſuppoſing her perfectly well read in the ſtory of "ſweet Agnes."

"I fear to tire you with royal and plebeian anecdotes on your return. As to myſelf, I cough leſs in the morning, and am better, though not ill before. Saturday's heat, and a rough horſe, put me in ſweet Agnes's condition:

Sur un cheval elle s'en va juchée,
Jambe meurtrie, et la ſ—écorchée."

Thirdly, Some more impiety dreſſed in the true aldermanic ſtyle

"*South Parade, Bath, Sunday, Dec.* 26, 1779.

"Shall I my deareſt Polly, give you an account of yeſterday's Chriſtmas dinner? It is ſo like an alderman to talk the day after of what he had yeſterday; yet, perhaps, being a female you may be curious, and therefore I give it: The paſchal lamb, with the fry—a *virgin* pullet, ſtuffed with *pigeon's* eggs—St. Peter's cock, à-la-cocky decky—a large cod's head from the miraculous draught—fricaſſee of *innocents*—cloven tongues avec de la ſauce au St. Eſprit—Baptiſt's head in a charger—calves heads à-la-Golgotha—des ſauciſſes *males* à-la-Madelaine. The deſſert conſiſted of *bonchretien* pears—and the wine was *lachryma Chriſti*, (the famous wine near Naples, called the *tears of Chriſt*. An Iriſhman ſaid, on taſting it, he wiſhed that Chriſt had wept in Ireland. Was not this a very ſuitable dinner for the anniverſary which was celebrated?"

Fourthly, If our readers have a reliſh for the ſilly and inſipid, they may read the following:

"*South Parade, Bath, Saturday, Dec.* 25, 1779.

"Mr. Wilkes roſe at ſix, and went through the operations of being ſhaved and dreſſed, then comforted himſelf with a breakfaſt; and proceeded to Bath, where he arrived before two. Much ſnow between Reading and Bath. Delighted with the apartments on the South Parade. The drawing-

room

room very ſpacious, and, being the end houſe, light. Three windows in front, two on the ſide. Viſited Dr. Wilſon, who is, indeed, greatly out of order, and Mr. Cruttwell ſays in a dangerous way. He was highly pleaſed with my coming. Cruttwell ſays that S——— is expected to propoſe terms to ſtop the intended publication of certain letters. My cough much better, and little fatigue from the journey. The ſharp cold air has produced a moſt voracious appetite in me, which I hope ſoon to allay, but not till I have aſſured my dear daughter, that I wiſh her all the compliments of this merry ſeaſon, and that I am her very affectionate father.

Adieu!"

Fifthly, If they wiſh to know what things are requiſite for living (we mean *eating*) well, they will find abundant information in the greater part of the letters of this worthy alderman. If they do not chooſe to purchaſe that information at the price of reading his letters, they may judge of his extenſive views, and deep practical knowledge in this way, by what he conſidered as a ſimple and patriarchal mode of living.

"The important cheſt of pine-apple rum, beaume de vie, orgeat, &c. &c. is not yet arrived, ſo that I live in the primitive ſimplicity of the patriarchal age, on fruits, milk, honey, and a little of the firſtlings of the flock, and a trifling morceau de venaiſon from the field or foreſt. What an exemplary life for an alderman!"

By ſeveral of Mr. Wilkes's letters from Bath, he appears to have been a ſort of paraſite to that weak and wrong-headed man, known by the name of Mrs. Macauley's Dr. Wilſon. Writing to his daughter, after the quarrel and ſeparation of the lady and the doctor, he gives her hopes of eventual advantage to herſelf from his attentions to the old man, whom, in his heart, he moſt have deſpiſed, and whom, by other letters, it is plain that he *did* deſpiſe. "———" (Alfred) Houſe is in great diſorder: "Mrs. ———" (Macauley's) woman is arrived, and the doctor, with the aid of a bookſeller, is ſeparating all his books from *hers*; and her clothes are looking out by the doctor's *male* ſervants. I poſtpone my viſits till this ſcene is cloſed; but *be it known unto you* that I am ſtill the *firſt favourite*. If it holds, *tant mieux pour* UNE CERTAINE DEMOISELLE." (Vol. II. Pp. 142, 143.) May we not, therefore, enumerate, among the qualities of this departed great man, that of a pitiful *legacy-hunter?* We had *almoſt* forgotten to mention that, in the firſt volume of the anonymous publication, there are ſome *things* called *poems*; had the Editor *altogether* forgotten them, he had done well.

We come now to the volumes partly written and partly edited by Mr. Almon. In them we can find nothing to warrant that ſuperiority over the anonymous publication which he claims; rather the contrary, as five volumes of very indifferent matter are worſe than four. They contain a "*rudis indigeſtaque moles*" of every thing which could be ſcraped together to make up bulk; of a variety of Wilkes's publications, which have been long before the public; of the moſt inſipid of all journals during his tour to Italy; of his already well-

known

known cauſe of quarrel with government, and all its conſequences; not, as it ought to have been, in a condenſed narrative, but ſpun out with the moſt tedious minuteneſs and tireſome prolixity; of letters to and from various correſpondents, of which a few, and only a few, are of any importance; of his correſpondence with his daughter, &c. &c.

Of the letters publiſhed by the anonymous Editor, Mr. Almon thus ſpeaks in his preface: "The Editor (Mr. A.) has been offered ſome collections of very trifling letters of Mr. Wilkes; but found that the letters themſelves were wholly unworthy of the public eye, and ſo utterly inſignificant and trifling, that it would have been indecorous, both in reſpect to the deceaſed and his readers, to have given them a place in this collection."

Here the coarſe proverb of the Pot and Kettle forces itſelf irreſiſtibly upon us. That it is fully applicable in the preſent caſe, a few extracts will determine.

"*February* 11, 1771.

"I am impatient to hear of my dear papa's ſafe arrival; and I ſincerely wiſh he may not have ſuch weather as we have here, which muſt make his tour diſagreeable, and occaſion his getting cold. It was ſo bad yeſterday that I would not go to church; and it continues to freeze very hard, with the proſpect of a great deal more ſnow. I went on Saturday afternoon to pay my reſpects to our good friends in the Cloiſters; whom I found very cheerful, though far from well. I have heard nothing worth communicating.

"I wiſh you a moſt agreeable journey; and I beg you to accept the ſincere aſſurance of the moſt tender love and duty of your grateful daughter,

MARY WILKES."

"*Monday Afternoon.*

"I am juſt favoured with my dear papa's letter of yeſterday; which, beſides the uſual pleaſure, affords me an agreeable ſurpriſe, as I imagined he was on his little excurſion.

"The chickens and rabbits have proved very good, and added to the *widow*'s admiration and mine of the judgment in marketing of the donor, equal in poultry to what it is in *fiſh*.

"Mr. Reynolds called here this morning, to enquire when you returned; as he wiſhed to know what would be moſt agreeable to you to be done at a meeting of your friends, intended to take place in a day or two. I preſſed him very much to write you all particulars relating to ſo intereſting a tranſaction, which I hope he will do. I am much edified by my dear papa's going to church; and hope his piety will be rewarded with a good ſermon whenever he is ſo well diſpoſed. He would have nothing to wiſh, were but the prayers granted of a heart that feels for him every ſentiment of duty and affection.

"*Ride, in the Iſle of Wight, Saturday, Aug.* 1.

"My deareſt Polly,

"It was ſo late on Thurſday before I reached Cobham, that I thought it moſt prudent to lie there: but I roſe very early yeſterday morning, by which I was enabled to reach this place laſt night; and am now proceeding to Mr. Jolliffe's. I had a navigation of only an hour and a half, in an open boat, to this charming ſpot.

"Mr.

" Mr. and Mrs. Garrick arrived at Mr. Fitzmaurice's on Wedneſday; and paſs the next week here, I am told.

" I wiſh you to ſend to know how Mrs. Barrel does in her great affliction.

" Bad pens, paper, and ink, at Ride; but good fiſh and wine. Unluckily, I can give you none of theſe latter; and can only employ the other to tell my dear daughter that I am well, and always her affectionate father.

Adieu!"

But we muſt not overload our page with extracts. If our readers are curious to know how many children, pigs, &c. Mr. W.'s landlady at Newhampton had, he himſelf will inform them. " I am very comfortably lodged here at a good widow's, Mrs. Searwell's, with nine children; eleven pigs, eight geeſe, three turkeys; one grand-ſignior cock, with a ſeraglio of ſeven hens, who have all ſeparate feather-beds of their own," &c. &c. If the hiſtory of Miſs Wilkes's drawers, and her father's bookcaſe, ſhould be objects of curioſity to them, more than one letter in the ſame volume will ſatisfy their longing. There, too, they will find nice light reading about Tunbridge ware, wheat-ears, and Miſs Wilkes's garters. If they wiſh to be informed of the plentiful ſupplies which poured into the alderman's larder, they have only to liſten to Miſs W.

" Very late laſt night came a baſket from Calais; containing three hares, eight partridges, and four capons. I immediately had all freſh packed for the alderman, except *un animal à quatre pattes, deux perdrix, et un* IMPARFAIT; which, I flatter myſelf, his worſhip will forgive my keeping."

We know not whether the ladies of Paris give the name of *imparfait* to a capon, or whether Miſs W. choſe to give to it this moſt appropriate appellation, to mark her proficiency in that ſtudy (anatomy) to which Mrs. Wolſtencroft ſo lately called the attention of the female ſex.

We cloſe theſe extracts with Letter XIII.

" *April* 13, 1778.

" *Bonnes nouvelles de Calais! Le froc François du patriote Anglois est retiré du vaisseau du Capitaine Gunston, et doit arriver très incessament par les soins des Messrs. Minet & Co.*

" I have juſt received a letter, dear papa, from Mr. Caffieri, with the above intelligence. I hope the coat will now arrive very ſoon, quite ſafe; and that ſometimes red, ſometimes blue, it will on both ſides become a Ranelagh waiſtcoat.

" Mrs. Cox would be much obliged to you to enquire after her picture at Mr. Hoare's. He does not know her by her married name.

" *Recevez, mon cher papa, les hommages les plus tendres et respectueux.*"

This French frock, (or one of the ſame family,) which appears to be of much importance in the correſpondence before us, as it is the ſubject matter of ſeveral letters, we have often ſeen the alderman bedecked in, to the no ſmall amuſement of the beholders.

Such, or ſimilar, are, in general, the ſubjects of theſe letters; and we think that Mr. Almon may reſt contented, if the public ſhould decide

decide as Palæmon did on the paſtoral trial of ſkill between Menalcas and Damœtas:

"Et vitulâ tu dignus, et hic."

Theſe volumes contain, beſides, ſome letters of Mr. Wilkes to his friend Cotes, which confirm that character with which his actions had already ſufficiently informed the world. There is likewiſe a variety of complimentary cards, "et id genus omne," to which we muſt refer our readers, ſhould they have any curioſity to peruſe them. We ſhall only mention a ſingular one from Dr. Johnſon's Boſwell, by which it appears that the ſon of the Earl of Bute, Lord Mountſtuart, like *a good Chriſtian*, had forgotten and forgiven all the rancorous invectives againſt his father, and was to play a friendly *trio* with Boſwell and the writer of the North Briton, at the Crown and Anchor. It is, perhaps, alſo not improper to notice a card from Earl Mansfield, in which he acknowledges the receipt of Mr. Wilkes's edition of Theophraſtus. Does the fiery demagogue, by this friendly preſentation, mean to unſay all he had written on the character of this illuſtrious judge, on whom he beſtows the appellation of "the *wretch* who preſided in the King's Bench;" or was it merely that ſpecies of attention, originating in vanity, which he, as a man of the world, (not in the beſt ſenſe of the word,) was ever ſolicitous to pay, and which he recommended to his daughter to pay to all *diſtinguiſhed* perſons, viz. perſons in *high life*, whether worthleſs or of worth? To decide on this point ſeems no difficult matter.

This brings to our recollection a paſſage in Mr. Almon's preface: "The Letters to his Daughter, ſelected by the Editor, contain principles the reverſe of thoſe of Lord Cheſterfield to his ſon. One exhibits the faſhionable refinements of vice; the other the pure emanations of virtuous paternal feelings. Now we think that the fact does not ſupport Mr. A. in his aſſertion. Mr. W. among his other qualities, poſſeſſed much vanity, and was fond of the manners and accompliſhments of the higher orders, more particularly of *French* manners and accompliſhments. Theſe he wiſhed his daughter to be miſtreſs of, and therefore ſent her to the diſſolute capital of France at an early age. From the manner and matter of many of her letters, the tinge ſhe there received is very perceptible. Mr. W. likewiſe appears to have been a tender and affectionate father; indeed ſo much ſo, that many of his epiſtles ſeem to contain rather the effuſions of a lover*, than the ſentiments of a parent. More too, he ſometimes deſires

* Among a variety of his letters in the ſame ſtrain, there is one, which we cannot at preſent turn to, in which he ſpeaks of having prepared a bed for her; which, when her *angelic* body ſhall be laid in, will be a perfect *paradiſe*. We never had the pleaſure of ſeeing the lady; but the public voice has always repreſented her as, at beſt, a favourable likeneſs of her

deſires her to go to Church, on what principle we know not, as he had made her familiar with his own *Anti-Chriſtian* ſentiments. But the father, who could ſo repeatedly entertain his daughter with his *infidelity*, who made her the confident of his *illicit amours*, who requires that daughter to get acquainted with Mr. and Mrs. Neckar, though "*proud* and *ill-bred*," merely becauſe they were "*diſtinguiſhed*," who writes to her about "Sauciſſes MALES à la Madelaine," &c. &c. has moſt certainly not that *pure* parental feeling for which he is praiſed by his biographer.

It is hardly worth mentioning that Mr. A. among her other qualities, boaſts of Miſs Wilkes's "talents in *ſcience*." Of this we find no evidence in the volumes before us; and we object to Dr. Hunter, the only voucher he gives. The doctor has written ſome indifferent popular ſermons, and was a profeſſional tranſlator from the French. His chief work in that way was his tranſlation of Lavater; this, luckily for him, paſſed through other hands before it went to preſs, it would have otherwiſe made as pitiful an appearance as his tranſlation of Sonnini. Of his *ſcientific* powers the public is utterly ignorant. But, had he been an adept in *ſcience*, and thus an adequate voucher of the ladies *ſcience*, in the preſent caſe it would have been of no avail, for he has given no teſtimony on that head. His card (which is inſerted in the volumes) is only a complimentary acknowledgment of her "candid and judicious criticiſm" on ſome prints in Lavater, of which, whatever ſhe may have been, he himſelf was no judge. The only *ſcientific* trace of the lady which we can diſcover in theſe volumes, is her aſcertaining that a *capon* is *un imparfait!*

But enough, perhaps, more than enough, of this publication. We cannot conceive what can induce any one to preſerve ſuch letters as have now paſſed in review before us. Mr. and Miſs Wilkes, however, muſt have thought that they were of importance, otherwiſe, after peruſal, they would, like other uſeleſs writings, have been turned into waſte-paper. But Wilkes had no ſmall opinion of himſelf, and, perhaps, thought that his momentary effuſions were things not to be loſt. His ſingular flattery of the parts, as well as perſon of his daughter, might lead her to form the ſame opinion of her productions: her Paris education would ſtrengthen this idea; and ſo we have nine volumes which can neither profit nor amuſe.

As to the pretence for the publications, viz. that the man who obtained for his country a releaſe from *general warrants*, ſhould not paſs

---

her father. If this be true, the father's compliment was like the old woman's *requeſt* in Prior's "Ladle,"—"what ſhould be *great* it turned to *farce*." Does not this warrant a ſuſpicion that the lady's fortune (which he appears to have ſhared with her throughout life) gave riſe, fully as much as parental tenderneſs, to this apparent fatherly affection, which is all along ſhewn? That he had need of her pecuniary aſſiſtance is evident; for, with all that aſſiſtance, and with an ample fortune of his own, his eſtate, at his death, was found totally inadequate to anſwer the bequeſts in his will.

away

away unnoticed, we will only say that we owe this blessing to Wilkes' as we owe the English reformation to the despotism and ungoverned appetites of Henry VIII. That, instead of shewing the sincerity of his patriotism, the editors have, indeed, shewn him to be "*un chevalier sans peur*," with which character he would have been flattered, were he alive; but certainly not "*un chevalier sans reproche*," a character which he, even with his overweening opinion of himself, durst not, in his conscience, aspire to. They have proved, with admirable minuteness and precision, the *real* character of the person to whom they have consecrated their volumes: but, on that subject, our countrymen had been sufficiently informed by convincing evidence, and had made up their minds accordingly: and we are much too dull to discover on what common-sense principle his present *would-be* friends should bring him before the public, after he was *dead*, and his works had followed him. Of one thing we are, however, certain, that could he peruse the voluminous publications which now appear, he would repay the very *friendly* tribute to his memory with any thing but *thanks*.

Sir Richard Hill's Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge.

(*Concluded from p.* 129.)

IT is a striking consequence of the Calvinistic system that it totally destroys the value of language, and renders it impossible for man to depend on the most seemingly clear and express declarations of God himself. If Sir R. Hill could be prevailed with but to *suppose* the doctrine of Universal Redemption true, we would ask him to give his opinion of the terms most proper for conveying it without danger of ambiguity or mistake. Could he point out any more fit for the purpose than such as the following? "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." "He tasted death for every man." If such phrases denote the limited and partial redemption of Calvin, we think it impossible that the opposite doctrine could be signified, by a revelation from heaven, in any words which should totally exclude uncertainty and doubt.

It is very observable, that the learned Baronet, who labours so earnestly, in this publication, to prove the articles and homilies Calvinistic, says nothing of the Liturgy. He probably felt that to reconcile Calvinism with that admirable service was a hopeless attempt. Indeed the falsehood and absurdity of Calvin's divinity are, in no point of view, more forcibly seen than in this, that every liturgy constructed on its principles, nay, every prayer conceived by its votaries, is demonstrable nonsense. Accordingly, the Calvinistic principles are totally useless in practice. No advice, reproof, or religious address of any kind, can be administered, till the wild Necessarian dogmas of

Calvin be completely forgotten or concealed from the mind: and this is acknowledged by Calviniſts themſelves. "*Dans les exhortations*," ſays the celebrated Jurieu, "*il faut neceſſairement parler à la Pelagienne*. The confeſſion is curious, not becauſe it expreſſes the truth (for Jurieu merely intended to inſinuate what is notoriouſly falſe, that thoſe who are not Calviniſts muſt be Pelagians), but becauſe it directly admits the fact, that by Calvin's tenet of predeſtination, all exhortation is rendered abſurd. In reſpect and veneration for our excellent liturgy, we will not yield to any man, not even to Sir Richard Hill, who, we think, has acted wiſely in abſtaining from any attempt to prove it Calviniſtic. Yet high as is our reſpect for the liturgy, our reſpect for the Scriptures is ſomewhat higher: and we humbly conceive that our venerable reformers, if they had been placed, by our author, on a footing with the prophets, would have had no juſt or reaſonable cauſe to complain. Sir R. might, therefore, very ſafely and conſiſtently have argued, that though the words of the liturgy are, to be ſure, completely Anti-Calviniſtic, they are, however, merely words of courſe, which nobody is obliged to regard or believe. The prophets, he ſays, in their remonſtrances to ſinners, "*though under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghoſt, yet expreſs themſelves after the manner of men*;" not as though God's deſigns could be made void, but to leave the impenitent without excuſe. (Pp. 10, 11.) We have already taken ſome notice of this paſſage, on which the more we reflect, the more we are ſhocked by its daring impiety. When our reſpectable and well-meaning author wrote it, he was, certainly, not aware of the import of his aſſertion; which, moſt clearly implies that the expoſtulations of the prophets, though inſpired by the immediate influence of the Holy Ghoſt, neither had, nor were intended to have, any beneficial effect whatever on the perſons to whom they were ſo ſolemnly addreſſed. If the prophets, therefore, as Sir R. ſays, "expreſſed themſelves after the manner of men," it was after the manner of VILLAINS AND LIARS: for HONEST AND GOOD MEN never ſpeak to deceive. And when it is conſidered that theſe prophets were "under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghoſt," the inference is inexpreſſibly horrible. That Sir R. abhors it as much as we do, we are thoroughly convinced. But he muſt be ſenſible that it is fairly deduced; and we hope that his prejudices are not ſo inveterate as to prevent him from *re-examining, at leaſt*, a ſyſtem which involves him in ſuch abominable conſequences.

The Biſhop has ſaid that "the introduction of Calviniſm, or rather its prevalence in any conſiderable degree, was ſubſequent to the beginning of Elizabeth's days." Sir R. contends that "if ever there was a moſt flagrant miſtake laid before the public eye, this is one." (P. 33.) In his preface, indeed, he roundly aſſerts that "the articles, *for more than a century* after they were ſet forth by authority, were never denied to be thoroughly Calviniſtic." But the Biſhop is right and Sir R. wrong. The aſſertion of the latter is ſo totally devoid of foundation that the articles were, in fact, never thought to be

"thoroughly

"thoroughly Calviniſtic," even by Calviniſts themſelves. If Sir R.'s ſtate of the caſe be juſt, we deſire him to give us a rational account of the fabrication of the Lambeth Articles, and of the efforts which were made to obtain their ratification. Were the learned Whitaker and his party ſuch fools as to labour for no purpoſe? Were all their aſſertions directed to no other end but to procure the eſtabliſhment of doctrines which they thought to be already completely eſtabliſhed in the articles of the Church? Why did the Calviniſts in the reign of Charles I. complain that the Royal Declaration, which merely enjoined them to take the articles in "the *literal* and *grammatical* ſenſe," reſtrained them from preaching the "ſaving doctrines," that is, the Calviniſtic doctrines, "*of God's free grace in election and predeſtination?*" (See Anti-Jac. Rev. XVII. Pp. 345—347. XVIII. Pp. 177, 179, 180.) Was it becauſe they believed the articles, when taken in the *literal* and *grammatical* ſenſe, to be "*thoroughly Calviniſtic?*" He who is capable of ſwallowing this, is, ſurely, capable of ſwallowing any thing. The truth is, that the Calviniſts of thoſe days knew that our original reformers were Anti-Calviniſts; and that the articles were never meant to be underſtood in a Calviniſtic ſenſe. They were much too honeſt to pretend the contrary; and, beſides, as they found that the ſentiments of Calvin began to prevail, they hoped to have influence ſufficient to effect an alteration in the national faith. Theſe were the foundations of all their efforts both under Elizabeth, and afterwards, at the Hampton-court conference, under King James. Our preſent Calviniſts are placed in a very different predicament; and, accordingly, their meaſures are altogether different. They are ſenſible that Calviniſm is on the decline. They have, of courſe, no proſpect of ſeeing the Calviniſtic doctrines ſanctioned by authority. They, therefore, inceſſantly ſtun us with the clamour that theſe doctrines are fully and explicitly contained in our preſent ſtandards. In this conduct, it is true, their good faith is much leſs to be admired than their ingenuity: for they cannot but know that they give the lie direct, not only to the avowed opinion of their predeceſſors, but to facts of the moſt acknowledged notoriety, and to the uniform current of our Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

Sir R., however, inſiſts that our original reformers, Cranmer, Jewel, &c. "were eſtabliſhed Calviniſts, from the beginning of the reign of the bleſſed young Proteſtant Monarch, till the hour of their deaths." The firſt proof of this is derived from a Catechiſm (attributed to Ponet, Biſhop of Wincheſter), which he calls "one of the moſt *ſavoury morſels* of Calviniſtic divinity which ever ſaw the light." (P. 34.); and which, he tells us, he "may probably ſoon publiſh, in a ſmall ſize, and at a ſmall expence." The worthy Baronet, we truſt, will not fail to keep his promiſe. We ſhall then be better able to judge of this Catechiſm, which, Sir R. informs us, "Cranmer was buſied in recommending and ſpreading throughout the whole kingdom, the very year after the articles were firſt ratified by King Edward." It may chance to have the fate of another Catechiſm, that

of Nowell, which, after having been likewiſe held up as a "moſt ſavoury morſel of Calviniſtic divinity," the Biſhop of Bangor has ſhewn not to be Calviniſtic. From Ponet's Catechiſm our author has given us an extract, which certainly contains nothing Calviniſtic, but which is in perfect uniſon with the doctrine of Cranmer's own Homily on Salvation.

But Cranmer, ſays our author, "during the whole of King Edward's reign, kept up a conſtant correſpondence with Mr. Calvin, by whoſe advice and aſſiſtance the liturgy of the Church of England was reviſed and altered in many points." (P. 36.) He alſo aſſerts that "Cranmer earneſtly beſought Calvin himſelf to write often to his Majeſty." (P. 37.) Now the fact is, that Cranmer, while he courted the correſpondence and aſſiſtance of Melancthon, declined thoſe of Calvin, becauſe, ſays Heylin, "he knew the man;" and that Calvin loudly and peeviſhly complained that his advice was neglected by the Engliſh Reformers. That letters ſhould have paſſed between him and them, at an early period of the Engliſh Reformation, can excite no ſurpriſe: for his name was of great celebrity. But that the correſpondence did not long ſubſiſt is ſtill leſs ſurpriſing: for, beſides, that his wild and extravagant dogmas ſhocked our venerable reformers, the temper of Calvin was ſo fierce and overbearing, that no man was able to keep on good terms with him. His haughtineſs and violence diſguſted all who had any connection with him.

The Baronet's next witneſs is Biſhop Jewell, from whoſe comments on the Epiſtles to the Theſſalonians he quotes ſome ſentences, which appear to be unconnected ſcraps, collected from various parts of the work, and tacked together at random. Yet even thus, they preſent no decided doctrine of Calviniſm, unleſs the mention of *God's election* muſt neceſſarily ſignify *Calviniſtic election*. Indeed, that theſe two phraſes are perfectly equivalent, Sir R. every where takes for granted, and accordingly, in the greater number of inſtances, his whole argument conſiſts in merely begging the queſtion. But the following paſſage is ſo very ſtrange, that it muſt not be paſſed without particular notice.

"Inſtead of bringing any more quotations from this truly ſound pillar of the Church of England (Biſhop Jewell), I ſhall beg leave to refer your Lordſhip to his *Apology* for that Church, and to the defence of it in anſwer to Harding the Jeſuit, where you will find *all the Calviniſtic points of divinity* ably defended againſt that artful ſon of Papiſtry." (P. 39.)

We have elſewhere ſaid of Jewell's "Apology," that "though it contains an able defence of our doctrines againſt the Church of Rome, it certainly does not repreſent them as Calviniſtical." (See Anti-Jac. Rev. XVIII. p. 177.) Our readers will obſerve, that Sir Richard's account of that celebrated work is directly contradictory to ours. This circumſtance, at firſt, gave us ſome uneaſineſs: for we could not allow ourſelves to ſuppoſe that our author would hazard ſo poſitive an aſſertion, without having carefully aſcertained the fact. We ſuſpected,

ted, therefore, that we had inadvertently contracted an erroneous impreſſion of the tendency of Jewell's work. In order to ſatisfy ourſelves on the ſubject, and that we might retract if we found ourſelves wrong, we again peruſed the whole with the greateſt attention. The reſult gives us deep and ſerious pain. For, though we cannot but be pleaſed that our ſtatement was correct, yet it grieves us more than we can well expreſs, to be under the neceſſity of explicitly charging SIR RICHARD HILL with one of the groſſeſt and moſt impudent attempts to impoſe upon the public which were ever made by any author. When we find a perſon of our author's years, rank in life, and reputation for piety, thus throwing all regard to character behind him in order to advance the intereſts of Calviniſm, what dependence can we have on the faith or veracity of thoſe among the Calviniſtic party who have hardly any character to ſupport? Yet Sir R. Hill has moſt ſolemnly affirmed a work to be Calviniſtic which, to go upon the moſt favourable ſuppoſition, he has evidently never read. With Jewell's anſwer to Harding we are not acquainted: but, with regard to the original work, the "Apologia Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ," we ſtake our credit with our readers and the public, on the truth of the aſſertion, that *it contains not one Calviniſtic ſentiment from beginning to end.* On the contrary, the only two paſſages in the book which have any relation to the points in controverſy between Calviniſts and Anti Calviniſts, maintain the doctrine of Univerſal Redemption in language as perſpicuous as was ever uſed by the moſt decided Arminian. We ſhall place the paſſages before our readers, after obſerving that we quote from the edition printed, "Ambergæ, typis Michaelis Forſteri, 1606."

"Credimus Jeſum Chriſtum, filium unicum æterni Patris, quemadmodum jam olim ante omnia initia decretum fuerat, cum veniſſet plenitudo temporis, ſuſcepiſſe carnem et omnem naturam humanam, ex beata illâ et pura virgine, ut indicaret hominibus arcanam et reconditam voluntatem Patris ſui quæ abdita fuerat a ſeculis et generationibus: utque in humano corpore perageret myſterium *redemptionis noſtræ*, et *peccata noſtra* et ſyngraphan illam, quæ erat ſcripta contra *nos*, affigeret ad crucem." (P. 33.)

Unqueſtionably, had Jewell believed that the benefits of our Lord's ſatisfaction extended to thoſe only whom Calvin and his followers call *the Elect*, he could not have had a more proper opportunity for declaring his belief, yet the other paſſage to which we have alluded is more ſtrikingly Anti-Calviniſtic ſtill.

"Dicimus hominem natum eſſe in peccato, et in peccato vitam agere: neminem poſſe vere dicere mundum eſſe cor ſuum: juſtiſſimum quemque ſervum eſſe inutilem: legem Dei perfectam eſſe, et a nobis requirere perfectam et plenam obedientiam: illi a nobis in hac vita ſatisfieri non poſſe ullo modo: neque eſſe mortalium quemquam qui poſſit in conſpectu Dei propriis viribus juſtificari. Itaque unicum receptum noſtrum et perfugium eſſe ad miſericordiam Patris noſtri per Jeſum Chriſtum, ut certo animis noſtris perſuadeamus illum eſſe propitiationem pro peccatis noſtris: ejus ſanguine omnes labes noſtras deletas eſſe: illum pacificaſſe omnia ſanguine cru-

cis ſuæ: illum unica illa hoſtia quam ſemel obtulit in cruce, omnia perfeciſſe, et ea cauſa, cum animam ageret, dixiſſe 'Conſummatum eſt:' *quasi significare vellet persolutum jam esse pretium* PRO PECCATO HUMANI GENERIS." (Pp. 61, 62.)

Sir Richard Hill may, however, perhaps call this Calviniſtic divinity: for we certainly would not engage to define the extent of a Calviniſtic underſtanding. It appears to us deſerving of notice, that, though Jewell repeatedly complains, in his "Apology," that the Engliſh reformers were ſtyled, by the Papiſts, *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*, yet he does not once hint that they were ever accuſed of being followers of Calvin; nor, indeed, as we formerly obſerved, does the name of Calvin once occur in his work. This to us is an incontrovertible proof that they were not, at that time, ſuppoſed to have adopted Calvin's opinions. On the whole, if we are to judge from the "Apology," the ſentiments of Jewell were Anti-Calviniſtic: and, as no man poſſeſſes a greater ſhare of our pureſt eſteem than the Biſhop of Lincoln, we rejoice in the conviction that, when our author delivered the following prediction, he miſtook the ſpirit by which he was inſpired. He will bring forward, he ſays, one teſtimony out of a thouſand which might be adduced in favour of the Calviniſtic ſentiments of Jewell. "And," adds he, "it ſhall be ſuch a one as will *certainly* make you wiſh [that] you had not diſturbed the ſhade of that departed ſaint; but having done ſo, when he has delivered his ſentiments, you will probably endeavour to remand him back to the regions of peace, with '*Why ſhakeſt thou thy hoary locks at me?*" (Pp. 37, 38.)

We have now to take notice of another very curious piece of management by this pious and conſcientious Calviniſtic ſenator. He gives us a long quotation from Strype, in which it is ſaid that, on a certain occaſion, "Ridley wrote a Treatiſe of God's Election and Predeſtination, and Bradford wrote another upon the ſame ſubject, and ſent it to thoſe three fathers (Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley), in Oxford for their approbation; *and theirs being obtained*," continues the hiſtorian, "the reſt of the eminent divines, in and about London, were ready to ſign it alſo." (P. 41.) Now what would Sir R. have us infer from theſe facts? 1. That Ridley muſt have been a Calviniſt, BECAUSE *he wrote a Treatiſe of God's Election and Predeſtination!* But Ridley's Anti-Calviniſm was avowed and notorious. 2. That Bradford was a Calviniſt. With our author, on this point, we ſhall have no diſpute. Bradford ſhall be a Calviniſt, if Sir R. pleaſes: for we care NOT a feather what opinions this famous Dean of St. Paul's entertained. We are ſure that he was a moſt extravagant enthuſiaſt, if not a downright madman. But, 3. Sir R. would have us conclude that Bradford's treatiſe actually RECEIVED the full approbation of the venerable Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley. And, in order that his readers might have no doubts on the ſubject, he prints the words *theirs being obtained* in capitals. The hiſtorian, however, merely means that, PROVIDED *the three Biſhop's approved Bradford's book*, the

the London Clergy were READY *to ſign it alſo.* Did Sir R. know nothing of Ridley's anſwer to Bradford? "Sir, in thoſe matters I am ſo fearful that I dare not ſpeak farther, yea, almoſt none otherwiſe, than as the very text doth (as it were) lead me by the hand." If this be the ſtyle of cordial approbation, we ſhall not be ſurpriſed, in the leaſt, to hear that the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers approve the divinity of Sir Richard Hill.

Sir Richard next appeals to Dr. Whitaker, who, certainly, very confidently aſſerts that the Church of England had always embraced Calvin's "opinion of election and reprobation." It is obvious, however, that the teſtimony of Whitaker is preciſely of the ſame importance as that of Sir Richard Hill, being the teſtimony of a zealous and confirmed Calviniſt in his own cauſe. The Baronet, indeed, is entitled to the preference: for, as far as we know, he has not, by his conduct, like Whitaker in the caſe of the Lambeth Articles, given the lie to his own aſſertions.

Recourſe is likewiſe had to the authority of Biſhop Carlton and Dr. Ward, two of thoſe divines who were ſent, by King James, to the Synod of Dort. The former wrote an anſwer to Mountague's famous "Appeal," which our author calls a *ſeditious* Appeal. But when he ſhall have recollected that the *imprimatur* to Mountague's book declared that "there was nothing contained in the ſame but what was agreeable to the public faith, doctrine and diſcipline, eſtabliſhed in the Church of England," he will ſee the neceſſity of tranſferring his epithet of *ſeditious* from the appeal to the anſwer. The licenſe by which Mountague's book was publiſhed proceeded from the higheſt authority in the kingdom. That authority pronounces it perfectly agreeable to the doctrine of the Church. Biſhop Carlton pronounces it inconſiſtent with that doctrine. Which are we to believe? But it is worth while to ſee how Carlton argues.

"The author of the *Appeal,*" he ſays, "pleaded againſt the Articles of Lambeth, and juſtified the doctrine of Barret, Baroe, and Thompſon, averring the ſame to be the doctrine of the Church of England. This he doth, not by naming of thoſe men, whoſe names he knew would bring no honour to his cauſe, but by laying down and juſtifying their doctrines, and ſuggeſting that they who maintained the doctrines contained in the Articles of Lambeth, are Calviniſts [ſurely he did theſe men no wrong by this ſuggeſtion] and Puritans; ſo that thoſe Reverend Archbiſhops, Whitgift and Hutton, with the Biſhops of our Church who then lived, are in his judgment to be rejected as Puritans. The queſtion is, whether of theſe two poſitions we muſt now receive for the doctrines of our Church, that which Barret, Baroe, and Thompſon would have brought in, which doctrines were theſe refuted and rejected by our Church; or that doctrine which the Biſhops of our Church maintained againſt theſe men; which doctrine hath been ſince, upon divers occaſions, approved? If there were no more to be ſaid, I dare put it to the iſſue before any indifferent judges." (Pr. 46, 47.)

Biſhop Carlton, we think, was more bold than wiſe. *Indifferent* judges, before they decided that he who rejects the Lambeth Articles

rejects the doctrine of the Church of England, would inquire whether the doctrine of both be the ſame. This identity Biſhop Carlton takes for granted: ſo that his reaſoning is a puerile *petitio principii*. But the mere inſpection of the Lambeth Articles (See Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. XVIII. p. 37.) is ſufficient to ſatisfy any perſon who is but moderately inſtructed in the principles of the Church of England, that the doctrines which they teach are very different indeed from thoſe of that Church; and their very exiſtence is an irrefragable proof that ſuch was the judgment of thoſe who compiled them. For certainly, as we have repeatedly urged, if the Calviniſts of thoſe days had thought, as the Calviniſts of theſe pretend to think, that the Church was wholly and clearly on their ſide, they would never have laboured ſo ſtrenuouſly to eſtabliſh, by the Lambeth Articles, opinions which could not be more expreſsly eſtabliſhed than they already were. This, in truth, is an argument againſt the force of which the whole body of our modern Calviniſts will ſtruggle in vain.

In our author's quotation from Dr. Ward, we are told that the "Univerſal Church hath always adhered to St. Auguſtine *in theſe points*, &c. The Church of England alſo," it is added, "from the beginning of the reformation, hath conſtantly adhered to him." (P. 47.) Sir R.'s *&c.* is here moſt impertinent: for, till we know what the points alluded to are, this truncated quotation has no meaning. We know that in many points Auguſtine departed from the Univerſal Church; and that the Church of England, which ſcrupulouſly adhered to the Univerſal Church, in many points departed from Auguſtine. But, whatever raſh poſitions Biſhop Carlton and Dr. Ward might be tempted to advance in the heat of controverſy, Sir R. knows, or ought to know, that, at the Synod of Dort, they openly maintained univerſal redemption, and the conſiſtency of grace with the freedom of human action. It is, therefore, impoſſible that they could have been Calviniſts.

In oppoſition to the Biſhop of Lincoln's doctrine, we are preſented with a pretty copious extract from a treatiſe written by his predeceſſor Biſhop Saunderſon, intituled *Pax Eccleſiæ*. The object of this treatiſe was evidently, as the title imports, to eſtabliſh peace between the contending parties. Sir R., indeed, ſays that "it ſtrongly maintains the whole Calvinian ſyſtem." This aſſertion is another luminous proof that Sir R. finds Calviniſm where almoſt every other perſon would find Anti-Calviniſm. For Saunderſon, in the very paſſage here quoted, aſſigns, as one reaſon of the differences then ſubſiſting, "the HARSHNESS of that opinion which Calvin and Beza are ſaid to have held, and many learned men in our Church are ſaid to have followed, concerning the decrees of Reprobation and Election, &c. &c." Is this the language of a decided Calviniſt? He blames the Arminians, indeed, for "ſeeking to derive envy upon the oppoſite opinions, by delivering them in terms odious, and of ill and ſuſpicious ſound; as viz. *Irreſiſtibility of grace, irreſpective decree*, &c. Whereas," he ſays, "the ſober divines of the oppoſite party ordina-

rily

rily do not use those terms, nor yet well approve of them, unless understood *cum grano salis.*" We must fairly acknowledge, with the good Bishop's leave, that we are apt to call things by their proper names. But it is easy to see that the venerable prelate did not "well approve of" the fore-mentioned *doctrines*, any more than of the *terms*, "unless understood *cum grano salis.*" What advantage, therefore, the cause of Calvinism has gained by this appeal to Saunderson, we do not perceive. But to the Baronet personally it has been of singular service; for it has furnished him with an opportunity of shining in the double capacity of an orator and of a wit. His eloquence is displayed in a warning harangue, which he makes Bishop Saunderson utter from the grave: it is written in the true Demosthenic style, and begins, "O ye men of Lincoln, &c." But we have not room to insert it. His wit must be allowed to cut with a keen and irresistible edge in the effusion which follows "Could we suppose a dialogue to take place between the dead and the living, it is to be feared there would not be so much harmony between the two Bishops of Lincoln, as there was between the two Kings of Brentford, who are introduced as both smelling at the same nosegay." (P. 55.)

But our learned author presses into his service the living as well as the dead. He read, he says, with no small satisfaction, the Charge of one truly worthy and honourable prelate, which, it seems, is altogether in his favour. Yet what does this prelate inculcate on his clergy? Why, to preach "*the pure doctrines of the gospel of peace; to insist upon that precious faith which is the gift of God, and is, in truth, the life and spirit of every thing which relates to vital religion.*" There is not, we are certain, a Bishop on the bench, and we trust that there never will be one, who would not heartily join in the same advice. There is here, of consequence, nothing particular. But Sir Richard goes upon the supposition that every Bishop who exhorts his clergy to preach *the doctrines of the gospel*, must mean by these doctrines *the system of Calvin.* The supposition is convenient for Sir R., to be sure: but he cannot be ignorant that it is totally false. Does Sir R. think the Bishop of Lincoln a Calvinist?

Another learned and distinguished prelate, in a Charge delivered in 1800, has also made use of language which our author seems to think entirely in his interest. His Lordship, as Sir R. exultingly observes, "*calls Mr. Calvin the venerable Calvin.*" "He expresses himself," says the Baronet, "in the most candid and Catholic manner upon *those very points* on which your Lordship has lately opened the sluices of controversy." (P. 57.) It is, surely, singular that our author's assertions should almost uniformly be in flat contradiction to the very authorities which he quotes in support of them. His extract from the Charge alluded to has no relation, even the most remote, to the points controverted by the Bishop of Lincoln. Its author is speaking of the *Episcopal Constitution of the Church*, and of *Church authority* as opposed to schism. In this view, and in this view only, he says, "I know not what hinders, but that the highest supralapsarian Calvinist may

may be as good a churchman as an Arminian." That his obſervations were not intended to apply to the doctrinal differences between the two parties on other ſubjects, is plain from the following explanation of his ſentiments, which is, indeed, ſo clear that it cannot be miſtaken. "This I know, that *the points of doctrine, in diſpute between the Arminians and the Calviniſts*, have ſo little to do with *the points of diſcipline, in diſpute between Churchmen and Schiſmatics*; that the opinions of St. Auſtin, which are the baſis of Calviniſm, have had their ſtrenuous aſſertors in the Church of Rome herſelf." The learned prelate's intention becomes ſtill more evident, when he adds, that, "if we would look for warm advocates of *Church-authority in general*, and for able writers in defence of *our own form of Church government in particular*, ſuch we ſhall find among thoſe divines of our Church who were called, in their day, *the doctrinal Calviniſts*."

The truth of this aſſertion we ſhall not controvert; becauſe it is, certainly, not *impoſſible* for a doctrinal Calviniſt to be an Epiſcopalian: though it is more, we think, than probable that, if the learned prelate's Charge had been compoſed ſomewhat later, his language would have been caſt in a different model. For in the very next year, our Calviniſts, by the mouth of their ſpokeſman Mr. Overton, declared that they allowed of no "Churchmen" but themſelves. It is, however, abundantly ſufficient for our purpoſe, that this learned prelate, in the paſſage produced by Sir Richard Hill, no farther approves of the ſentiments of Calviniſts, than they favour "Church-authority in general," and "our own form of Church-government in particular." Of the principal diſputes between Arminians and Calviniſts he gives no opinion, though the Baronet has expreſsly affirmed the contrary. He ſays, indeed, that, when he ſpeaks of Calviniſm, "he looks only to Calviniſm, ſuch as the *venerable* Calvin would himſelf have owned, not enriched and embelliſhed with the extravagancies of later viſionaries." The learned prelate, who is himſelf a Churchman, a conſiſtent, and, therefore, a HIGH CHURCHMAN, will, perhaps, recollect the obſervation of Dr. Kipling, "that to compliment Calvin's memory in print, for a preface or dedication only (ſo critical are the preſent times), is not altogether harmleſs." We ſhall have, at leaſt, we are certain, his Lordſhip's thanks for our uniform endeavours, in oppoſition to the diſingenuous arts of our preſent Calviniſts, to exhibit Calviniſm, *ſuch as it is*, ſuch, in ſhort, *as it was manufactured and owned by the venerable Calvin himſelf*.

Sir Richard deals greatly in certain flowers of rhetoric very proper for amuſing the imagination, and for nothing elſe. In one place he tells us that the duties of the paſtoral office are "neither to be learned at a card table, in a ball-room, a play-houſe, or a dog-kennel, nor in a circle of jovial bottle-companions." (P. 59.) Will Sir R. be obliging enough to name the perſons who have ſaid that they were? In another place he aſſures us that ſeveral of the clergy with whom he has the happineſs of being particularly acquainted,

"Men of real grace and true humility, attached by every principle to our

our excellent conſtitution both in Church and State, are now held up to public odium, branded with names of reproach equally unjuſt and ignominious, inſomuch, that whoſoever ventures too near them is ſuppoſed to be in danger of catching the infection of Puritaniſm, Methodiſm, Schiſm Enthuſiaſm, Fanaticiſm, Jacobiniſm, and almoſt every other ISM that can be thought of." (Pp. 60. 61.)

To this pathetic lamentation we can only anſwer that, in our opinion, the danger is very great. And Sir R. may ſay;

" Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
Et dici potuiſſe, *et non potuisse refelli.*"

Our author aſſures us that, " at this very moment, ſome of the moſt able, pious, laborious miniſters in the kingdom are not only ſhut out of lectureſhips, but out of the Churches, *merely becauſe they believe our articles according to the original ſenſe of our reformers.*" (P. 59.) This, we think, is an eminent inſtance of the figure according to which grammarians derive *lucus a non lucendo.* But, if the wicked Arminians endeavour, now and then, to ſhut theſe pious miniſters out of the Churches, the godly Calviniſts are ſtill more indefatigable in bringing them in. It may, perhaps, be not altogether unknown to Sir Richard Hill, that aſſociations have been formed, and contributions raiſed, for the purpoſe of buying up as many advowſons as poſſible, in order that the Church may be properly ſupplied with abundance of right " evangelical" miniſters.

" Your Lordſhip," ſays our author, " is too well acquainted with the language of the Confeſſional, the Independent Whig, and other more recent publications by men of talents and abilities, to render it needful for me to make any obſervations on the contempt and obloquy, which for ſome years paſt have been caſt on thoſe called, or rather *miscalled*, the *regular Clergy of the eſtabliſhment*, for ſubſcribing to articles in a ſenſe directly oppoſite to their *plain, literal, grammatical meaning.*" (P. 61.)

Yes, Sir, and you and your friends are the principal authors of this obloquy and contempt. You, contrary to common ſenſe and truth, hold up the Articles as Calviniſtic; and ſuch writers as thoſe whom you have mentioned, who care as little for Calviniſm as for Anti-Calviniſm, are happy to take advantage of your miſrepreſentation, that they may have a pretext for abuſing the clergy. But your *ſtill* preſuming to urge the ROYAL DECLARATION as a proof of the CALVINISTIC ſenſe of the articles is a pitch of aſſurance to which we thought even *you* incapable of aſcending.

The facetious Baronet has many excellent obſervations (which we are forced to omit) on the evil conſequences of the " flimſey, lax, ambiguous, prevaricating mode of ſubſcription which clerical convenience and ingenuity have diſcovered." " Let us carry this idea," he obſerves, " into our code of laws, what confuſion would enſue on the interpretation of *wills, legacies, deeds, bonds, releaſes*, &c. &c. Charming work and amuſement would it make for the gentlemen of the long robe!" (P. 63.) This is bad enough, of all conſcience, we

muſt

muſt own; though the learned Baronet, at other times (as we have already remarked), can diſpenſe with the literal meaning of words. But the looſe mode of interpretation adopted by the clergy would, if carried into common life, be productive of ſtill more dangerous effects. It would affect not only the *purſes*, but the *perſons* and *lives* of his Majeſty's loyal ſubjects. On the latter head our author's fears are thus expreſſed:

"Extend it to phyſic, and who could know the meaning of *the doctor's medical Latin! One apothecary* might ſend the patient *good wholeſome drugs*, ſuited to his caſe; another might put a different conſtruction on the phyſician's preſcription, and doſe the poor ſick man to death, by large quantities of *ipecacuhana and laudanum:* both, however, leſs dangerous than thoſe doſes of *ſpiritual ipecacuhana and laudanum*, which are ſo copiouſly ſent forth from too many ſubſcribing *clerical ſhops* throughout the kingdom; and which can only ſerve as *emetics* and *ſoporifics*, wherever they are adminiſtered." (Pp. 63, 64.)

Our readers, we truſt, will agree with us that of the foregoing paſſage the dignity, the juſtneſs, and the wit are nearly equal. The following is of a very different kind, and, of courſe, muſt be appreciated by a different ſtandard. Of the two, however, it is certainly the more curious.

"The thirty-nine Articles, however, ſtand firm, as the walls and bulwarks of our Sion; and it is not in the power of all the arts of twiſting, torturing, wire-drawing, falſe-gloſſing, and ſubterfuging, which ſophiſtry and duplicity can muſter up, to evade the force of them, as they ſtand in their own original ſimple dreſs, in the Book of Common Prayer. From this book, however (I mean from thoſe copies of it that have been printed ſince Archbiſhop Laud's time), care has been taken to expunge many ſtrong morſels of Calviniſm, which are ſtill to be found in the old folio editions of that excellent form of ſound words, which was reviſed, corrected, and altered, ſome things left out, and others inſerted, by the particular advice and aid of Mr. John Calvin, as Mr. Strype informs us. Among thoſe ſtrong and ſavoury morſels, I reckon the Confeſſion of Faith, one prayer in the burial ſervice, and another at the end of the reading Pſalms." (P. 67.)

On the firſt ſentence of this extract we ſhall make no remarks. It is mere common place, to which every reader will affix the ſenſe which, by his previous prejudices, he is diſpoſed to admit. But the other two ſentences greatly ſurprized us, and we ſeriouſly regret that Sir R. has left us completely in the dark, with regard both to the "Confeſſion of Faith," and to the "prayers" which he mentions. That they are *ſtrong and ſavoury morſels of Calviniſm* we are very willing to believe; for in Calviniſm Sir R. is undoubtedly an epicure. But, although by the confeſſion, we may expoſe our ignorance, we are forced to own, that we never heard of theſe ſavoury morſels, having never had the good fortune to meet with a copy of the editions in which they are contained. In Wheatly, who has the reputation of an accurate and well-informed writer, no intimation is found, that

theſe ſavoury morſels ever conſtituted part of the Book of Common Prayer. Sir R.'s language, however, is, we will not ſay *intended*, but certainly *calculated* to lead the reader to ſuppoſe that Archbiſhop Laud was guilty of the crime of falſifying the Book of Common Prayer, and that the fraud has been continued by the wicked Arminians ever ſince. But we can partly conceive how the matter ſtands. Sir R. has ſeen a copy of the Prayer Book containing theſe precious morſels of Calviniſm. It is evident, *a priori*, either that ſuch copy muſt belong to an edition clandeſtinely printed, and purpoſely interpolated by Calviniſtic influence; or that the morſels which Sir R. ſo highly values were ſimply *bound up* with the Prayer-Book. Which of theſe two ſuppoſitions is the fact, we muſt wait for farther information to aſcertain; but one of them muſt be true: for no ſuch Prayer Book as Sir R. deſcribes ever was, or could be printed *by authority*. The firſt ſuppoſition is not very inconſiſtent with the known ſpirit of Calviniſts. With reſpect to the ſecond, we take the liberty to hope that, ſhould our author be pleaſed to bind up with his Prayer-Book, the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion*, or *Calvin's Inſtitutes*, he will not inſiſt on our acknowledging either the ſecond or third as a part of the firſt. In this hope we repreſs, at leaſt for the preſent, a number of reflections which crowd upon our minds.

It is impoſſible to conceive a more wayward and unreaſonable being, than a man whoſe mind is thoroughly tinctured with the true ſpirit of Calviniſm. In ſuch a man's eyes, whatever an Anti-Calviniſt ſays or does muſt be wrong in itſelf, and proceed from bad motives. Our author ſays, that "the doctrines of the Church of England are ſound, ſpiritual, vital, evangelical, Calviniſtical." He adds, that they are "built indeed upon the foundation of the prophets and apoſtles, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the corner-ſtone." (P. 68.) He undoubtedly expects this aſſertion to be believed. Yet obſerve with what a different meaſure he metes to himſelf and to the Biſhop of Lincoln. When his Lordſhip aſſerts, that the doctrines for which he contends are built upon the ſame foundation, our author aſks, "Is there an heretic upon earth who would not ſay the ſame? Search out all the learned Arians and Socinians throughout the land, and you will not find one who will not plead ſcripture for the ground of his belief; all and each individually will affirm, that his faith is built upon the apoſtles and prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner-ſtone." (P. 50) We mean not to call in queſtion either the truth or the propriety of theſe profound obſervations. We ſhould ſimply like to know what it is which makes ſo marked a diſtinction between the Biſhop and Sir Richard, that ſuch reflections ſhould be naturally ſuggeſted by the affirmation of the one, and not of the other.

But the worthy Baronet ſees every expreſſion of his learned antagoniſt through a medium which at once diſcolours and diſtorts it. "I am," ſays the Biſhop, "moſt ready to allow that many Calviniſts have been pious and excellent men, and I am fully ſatisfied that there are, in theſe days, many zealous Chriſtians, both among the clergy and

and the laity, of that perſuaſion, who would be among the firſt to deplore any evil which might befal our conſtitution in church and ſtate." *We* ſhould ſay that this paſſage is moderate and handſome, ſuch as well becomes a Chriſtian Biſhop, and a gentleman. Our author talks of it in a very different ſtyle. "To what end," he aſks, "are ſuch conceſſions, after the harſh treatment which the maintainers of them (the Calviniſtic doctrines) have received from your Lordſhip's lips and pen? They may, *in the weak and ſcanty minds of ſome*, be looked upon as the effuſions of a peaceful ſpirit of candour and forbearance, as the breathings of pure charity and brotherly love; whilſt *men of judgment* will eſteem them only as the mere daubings of a *timid tergiverſation*." (P. 68.) Our author's ſentiments, it muſt be acknowledged, are here very fully and perſpicuouſly expreſſed; nor are they, we conceive, in the ſmalleſt danger of being looked upon either by *men of weak and ſcanty minds*, or by *men of judgment*, as the effuſions of a peaceful ſpirit of candour and forbearance, or as the breathings of pure charity and brotherly love. We were once pretty intimately acquainted with a lady whoſe Calviniſm was of the ſublimeſt caſt, inſomuch that ſhe openly profeſſed her conviction, that her huſband, the moſt benevolent of men, and a dignitary of the Church of England, becauſe he did not believe in Calvin's reprobation, would infallibly be damned. When this charitable lady was put in mind that ſhe had no right to judge ſo harſhly of the ſtate of thoſe who differed from her, ſhe conſtantly replied in this elegant phraſe, "*I hate the ſtinking cant of candour.*" The worthy Baronet ſeems to be of a congenial ſpirit. In one point, however, we can hardly agree with him. The *ſeeming* moderation of the Biſhop is aſcribed by him, to *timidity*. His Lordſhip, we think, has never diſcovered, and we are confident that he never will diſcover, *timidity* in aſſerting the truth. But of whom does our author ſuppoſe the Biſhop afraid? If the worthy Baronet has not lately read the amuſing and inſtructive fable of a fly, proudly perched on a chariot, and rapidly driven along a duſty road, he may, perhaps, peruſe it again with advantage.

However ſtrongly Sir R. like our former female acquaintance, may "*hate the ſtinking cant of candour*," he has evidently no averſion to cant of another kind. "Should your Lordſhip," he ſays, "feel any degree of uneaſineſs on the peruſal of this epiſtle, you have many comforters at hand, whilſt I myſelf can boaſt of but few: I have, however, the comfort of my own conſcience, in knowing that I have acted with a ſingle eye to God's glory, and not without earneſt prayer for his direction." (P. 69.) This is, certainly a very curious paſſage in ſeveral reſpects. For firſt, although it is extremely obvious that it muſt be very deſirable for his Lordſhip, ſhould he be diſturbed by our author's publication, to have many comforters; we are ſomewhat at a loſs to conceive the reaſon why Sir R. complains that he himſelf can boaſt of but few. His good nature, we preſume, makes him ſympathiſe ſo deeply with the pain which he ſuppoſes his pam-

phlet to have inflicted on the Biſhop's mind, that he ſtands in need of a multitude of comforters to conſole him for having wounded his brother's peace. But whatever occaſion our author may have for many comforters, and however few, in compariſon with the Biſhop, he may have at hand, he hints, in polite and gentle terms, that he has ſuch comforters as his Lordſhip cannot have. How, indeed, can an Anti-Calviniſt have "the comfort of his own conſcience," who can never be allowed to act "with a ſingle eye to God's glory," and who conſequently muſt be ſuppoſed to act "without earneſt prayer for his direction?" Shall this conſtruction of our author's words be deemed unfair? Then we ſay that his language in this place has no meaning. But, we beg our author's pardon; it may be only an expreſſion of that "humility of mind which," Mr. Overton ſays, "ſo highly becomes the character of Chriſtians in their beſt eſtate." Yet our firſt interpretation ſeems in perfect uniſon with the charitable tendency of the following plain paſſage.

"Your Lordſhip very properly recommends zeal to your clergy, and more properly ſtill, a zeal according to knowledge, without which it is more apt to exert itſelf againſt what is truly praiſeworthy, and to become a *zeal perſecuting the Church*, than in favour of the doctrines which are according to godlineſs; and hence we ſhall ſometimes find that *a few* of the *regular clergy* are quite alert, and all alive, when ſtorming *the evangelical citadel*, or *the ramparts of Calviniſm*, though they appear tame and quiet enough when reading over *the dirty, old, dog-eared ditty, which comes in turn out of the old family bundle*. The reaſon is plain enough: *in the one caſe the heart is earneſt in the buſineſs; in the other the lips only are engaged.*" (P. 70.)

The learned Baronet, not ſatisfied with what he had done in the body of his pamphlet, has added a poſtſcript of ſeventeen pages, on which we can afford to beſtow but a few ſhort remarks. The firſt recurs again to the attributes of God, which he repeats, "the Calviniſt dares not meaſure by the *crooked line* of his own *darkened underſtanding*; but makes *carnal reaſon* know its own place, and ſubmit to divine faith." By way of puzzling the Biſhop, our author begs him to ſolve the queſtion, "why God ever permitted ſin to enter into the world?" He urges the conduct of the Children of Iſrael, who, in conſequence of a divine command, ſpoiled the Egyptians; and the caſe of the forty-two young infants, who were torn in pieces by two ſhe-bears, in conſequence of being curſed by the prophet Eliſha. Whatever, on theſe points, may be the Biſhop's opinion, it is plain that Sir R. in order to ſecure his favourite Calviniſm, would willingly ſacrifice to atheiſts and infidels both natural Religion and Revelation. Perhaps his queſtion might be properly enough anſwered by another: "Why did God create any *free* and *accountable* beings?" And with regard to our author's particular caſes, if he can really ſee no difference between theſe and that of God's condemning to eternal torments the greater part of mankind, for no other reaſon but that he chooſes to do ſo; then we think that Sir R. is in a very fair way to

"live

"live and die," (as he says, "his heart's desire and prayer *is*,") "*the rankest Enthusiast, Calvinist, and Methodist that ever existed.*" (P. 72.)

Our author next resumes the Bishop's affirmation, that "much remains to be done by men themselves, before they can have any share in the benefits of their Redeemer's blood." This doctrine Sir R. cannot yet understand; and his reasoning with regard to it is truly admirable.

"How any man," he says, "can or will do all this MUCH in a state of nature, we are not told. Should your Lordship reply, that the persons you mean have already a *true and lively faith in Christ*, are already partakers of the *grace of Christ* and the *inspiration of his Spirit*; then, my Lord, I must subjoin, [Mr. reader, the consequence,] that they are indeed justified believers, and such as are undoubtedly in a state of salvation, and *now have their share in the benefits of their Redeemer's blood*; consequently, instead of MUCH, *nothing* remains *to be done by themselves*, to procure what they are already possessed of, and that freely, without money and without price, unless your Lordship can make it appear, that possessing, and not possessing, are one and the same thing." (Pp. 77 and 78.)

It is curious to observe with what marked antipathy Calvinists always speak of *sincerity*. This antipathy is as strongly expressed by our author, as it was by Mr. Overton. Thus he tells us, that by the law of grace or the gospel dispensation, "sincerity of endeavour on our part is totally excluded;" and that "what is obtained by the sincerity of our own endeavours can never be reckoned of grace, but of debt." "If by the *law of the Gospel*," he afterwards adds, "be meant a new *remedical* law, suited to our present fallen state, and which mitigates the rigour of the moral law of works, *accepting sincerity instead of perfection*, I must declare, without hesitation, that neither Scripture nor the Church of England know any thing of such a law, or such a dispensation." (Pp. 78, 79.) This doctrine, we know, has the sanction of great names, such as those of Mr. Overton, Mr. Wilberforce, and Sir Richard Hill. But had it the sanction of an angel from Heaven, it would equally continue to be what it is, a glaring and palpable contradiction. Our readers may see our sentiments with regard to it, Vol. XV. Pp. 382—384; and we must, *without hesitation*, repeat, that "it is founded in a most shameful misconception of the very nature of the Christian dispensation."

When the Bishop speaks of "the *redemption purchased* by the blood of Christ," Sir R. says, that his Lordship might as well talk of *an atoned atonement*, or *a salvation saved*. His reason is, that "not *redemption*, but *the persons redeemed*, were the objects of Christ's purchase." (P. 80.) This criticism is by much too refined and deep for us to meddle with. But the Baronet's observations on his Lordship's assertion that, throughout our Common Prayer, "good works are never represented as unnecessary to salvation," deserve to be inserted as *a strong and savoury morsel* of Calvinism. We shall insert them, however, without any comment, having frequently, on former oc-

caſions, made our readers acquainted with our opinion of their value.

"And pray, my Lord, who ever ſaid they were ſo? I am ſure no Calviniſt, or *evangelical preacher* whatever, would affirm any ſuch thing. That they have no part in procuring the pardon of ſin and acceptance with God, *(which is by faith only as apprehending the righteouſneſs of Chriſt)* every faithful miniſter will conſtantly maintain; but that good works are the neceſſary fruits and evidences of lively faith, every ſound divine will not only admit, but will earneſtly contend for them in that view." (Pp. 80, 81.)

Our laſt quotation from our author's publication ſhall be a pretty long one; exhibiting, at large, his attachment to the conſtitution of that Church of which he profeſſes himſelf ſo zealous a member.

"Your Lordſhip laments the growth of ſectaries, and that many leave the communion of the eſtabliſhed Church. But, if diſſenting congregations increaſe, as they certainly do, the true cauſe often is, that thoſe who are become their miniſters, could not get ordination in the Church of England, becauſe they had not regularly taken their degrees at the Univerſity, though in other reſpects by no means deficient in learning or abilities, *and well qualified by diſtinguiſhing gifts of grace and divine knowledge.* And are not ſuch men as eminently fitted to preach the goſpel of peace to a plain country congregation, as thoſe who are adepts in logic, mathematics and algebra, or in all the abſtruſer points of phil ſophy? But they have not attended the divinity lectures. If *divinity lectures* were always *lectures in divinity,* [the Baronet is witty!] there might be ſome weight in this objection; but, *in general,* what are modern divinity lectures, but ſo many pompous, dry, bad ſermons, without *ſpiritual ſavour,* or *unction,* and often without that name, which is above every name, being once mentioned? In ſhort, *divinity lectures* (by courteſy ſo called), have nothing *divine* about them." [Bright wit again!]

"It very frequently happens that, when a young man is pionſly diſpoſed, and earneſtly wiſhes to get into the Church, the poverty of his parents cannot afford him a Univerſity education; he devotes himſelf to his ſtudies, and makes progreſs in the common branches of learning; he applies for orders, and brings teſtimonials of his ſound faith and exemplary moral conduct; but he is rejected, as not being Bachelor or Maſter of Arts. Add to this defect, he perhaps lies under the ſuſpicion of Methodiſm; or of being tainted with Calviniſtic principles, in proof of which he is known to attend thoſe who are *miſcalled* EVANGELICAL PREACHERS; or he is an enthuſiaſt, has been heard to talk of *inward feelings,* and of the *love of God ſhed abroad in the heart;* or he is ſingular, preciſe, and *righteous overmuch;* to crown all, he *depreciates good works,* and he is held up as an enemy both to Church and State."

"Under all this load of obloquy, what can a poor, injured, perſecuted young man do? He prefers, and loves the eſtabliſhed Church, and he truſts that *he is called of God,* or, as the Ordination Office has it, that he is *inwardly moved by the Holy Ghoſt,* to take upon him the work of the miniſtry. Muſt he then *bury his talent in the earth, or hide it in a napkin?* He dares not do ſo; he ſtill waits in hopes of epiſcopal ordination, but it cannot be obtained. Remonſtrance is of no avail. He is excluded. By what law? By the law of reaſon [*carnal* reaſon] or juſtice? Nay, but by the law of

power. He is invited to take charge of a congregation among the Diſſenters; becomes a miniſter in that line, and draws many after him from the Church to the Meeting, who never return from the Meeting to the Church again." (Pr. 86—89.)

That diſſent and ſchiſm are too common in the land, is a fact which muſt be equally acknowledged and deplored. But how is it to be accounted for? Not by the miſconduct of our ſpiritual governors; but firſt, by the vitiated appetite of the people, who prefer poiſoned nonſenſe to wholeſome doctrine; and principally, by the countenance and encouragement of ſuch Churchmen as Sir R. Hill, who tell the people that it is of no importance, provided they hear what is good, whether they hear it in the Meeting Houſe, or in the Church. But the Biſhops, according to Sir R. Hill, are perſecuting tyrants, who exclude from the Church young men of the moſt "diſtinguiſhing *gifts of grace and divine knowledge.*" Their Lordſhips, it would ſeem, are no proper judges of the qualifications of theſe pious young men. When ſuch candidates, therefore, apply to them for orders, might it not be eligible to have a board appointed, conſiſting partly of Calviniſtic "True Churchmen," and partly of avowed Diſſenters, in order to aſcertain their *gifts and graces?* Of this Board Sir R. might be conſtituted preſident. The Biſhops would then be in no danger of incurring, in this reſpect at leaſt, the guilt of perſecution, ſince they would have nothing to do but to lay their hands on ſuch *men of inward feelings* as the Board had approved. There might, indeed, be ſome danger that the Church ſhould be filled with ignorant blockheads and wild fanatics; but there would be plenty of "ſpiritual ſavour and unction." Beſides, after all, what advantage can divines receive from what is fooliſhly *miſcalled* a learned education, ſince in our Univerſities, the "*divinity lectures*," we are poſitively aſſured, "*have nothing divine about them?*"

But, when a hopeful young man of ſuch "divine gifts and knowledge," is refuſed by the Biſhops, "*what can he do?*" We anſwer, *without heſitation*, let him betake himſelf to ſome uſeful occupation, by the exerciſe of which he may benefit the State, inſtead of diſturbing and diſgracing the Church. But, ſubjoins our author, "*he dares not do ſo.*" He is not, however deficient in boldneſs; for he dares to be guilty, not only of ſchiſm, but of impudent and ſacrilegious intruſion in the ſacred office. He firſt takes upon him, without any authority, that character, which even our Saviour himſelf would not aſſume till he was regularly commiſſioned; and this uſurped character he afterwards makes uſe in labouring, to the whole extent of his abilities, to rend and tear in pieces the body of Chriſt. Thus acts Sir Richard Hill's "*young man of grace*," who truſts that he is "*inwardly moved by the Holy Ghoſt, to take upon him the work of the miniſtry*;" and he acts with Sir Richard's full approbation! Were our author but half as well read as he pretends, in the writings of the excellent Biſhop Jewell, he could not be ignorant how widely he has, in this, as in many other reſpects, departed from the primitive principles of the Reformed Church

Church of England. Theſe principles, as they relate to the preſent ſubject, are ſhortly and perſpicuouſly ſtated by Jewell in his Apology. We ſhall copy the paſſage in which they are contained, and leave Sir Richard Hill to meditate, at his leiſure, on the ſtriking oppoſition between them and his own.

"*Miniſtrum legitimè vocari oportere, et rectè atque ordine præfici Eccleſiæ Dei: neminem autem ad ſacrum miniſterium pro ſuo arbitrio et libidine, poſſe ſe intrudere. Quo major nobis ab iſtis fit injuria, quibus nihil ſæpius in ore eſt quam apud nos nihil ordine, nihil decenter, omnia confuſè ac perturbatè fieri: omnes apud nos eſſe ſacerdotes, omnes eſſe doctores, omnes eſſe interpretes.*" (Apol. P. 40.")

Harveſt Home, conſiſting of ſupplementary Gleanings, original Dramas, and Poems; Contributions of literary Friends, and ſelect Re-publications, including Sympathy, a Poem, reviſed, corrected, and enlarged, from the Eighth Edition. By Mr. Pratt. 3 vols. 8vo. about 1648 pages. Phillips. 1805.

BEFORE we enter upon this work, we have to make one obſervation on the claſs of writings to which, till examined, it may appear to belong. We have peremptorily given our opinion hoſtile to all compilations and book-making. From this general proſcription we do not know of any exceptions we can admit, beſides collections fot the reading of children and ſchool-boys; and extracts from moral, pious, and loyal treatiſes ſimplified to the comprehenſion of the low and ignorant. All aſſemblages of excerpts and quotations intended for the peruſal of perſons of education, we conſider as mere waſte of paper and print. Having made theſe general remarks on compilations, we with great pleaſure declare that there is much leſs of quotation and extract in this publication than the title would lead a reader to anticipate; and that the greater part, whether the production of Mr. Pratt or his friends, is original.

Our author commences with ſupplementary gleanings. He takes his ſtation in Hampſhire, and gives a very lively and agreeable deſcription of the county, the city of Wincheſter, and the ſeveral towns, the ſcenery, and manners of the country. In all the works of Mr. Pratt there prevails a ſpirit of ardent and delicate benevolence, which ſpeaks to the heart as ſtrongly as his ſenſible obſervations ſpeak to the head. Highly as we prize this valuable quality, we cannot help obſerving, that in Mr. Pratt it ſometimes operates to exceſs, and induces him to beſtow praiſes upon books, and upon individuals, which cannot be allowed to the alleged extent, by the rigid and impartial juſtice of either literary or moral criticiſm. *Nil admirari* was a maxim of one of the ſoundeſt judges and ableſt eſtimators of either literary or moral criticiſm; and when received with limitations, which the good ſenſe of Horace evidently meant, was certainly

one of the moſt ſalutary precepts which he delivered. We regret that the benignity of Mr. Pratt's heart repeatedly leads him to exhibit authors of very ordinary talents and very inferior literary reputation, as perſons of genius; and that he exalts reſpectable but common moral characters into a degree of perfection which is rarely attained by human nature.

There is a very clear and conciſe outline of the progreſs of the maritime towns of Hampſhire in ſhipping, about the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. There are ſeveral amuſing anecdotes about different kings of England. We perfectly agree with Mr. Pratt's eſtimation of William Rufus; but not altogether in his opinion of William the Conqueror. Our author's general judgment upon that ſovereign ſeems to be too much founded on his afforeſting great tracts of land; whereas that was not the ſole ground which William left for appreciating his conduct. Neither do we altogether agree with his view and eſtimate of the conduct of Henry the Second in ſubmitting, for political reaſons, to the mandates of the Church; we do not with Mr. Pratt judge that ſubmiſſion mean, but, on the contrary, the ſacrifice of a wiſe and magnanimous mind to the neceſſity of the times; and therein we agree with Mr. Hume who has not conſidered the ſubject without attention.

In his account of Wincheſter, the author confers a juſt tribute of applauſe on Dr. Warton. Much of this was well known before; however, it is a pleaſing part of the ſelection. Mr. Mant's poem, which our author very highly praiſes, appears to us the production of a good claſſical ſcholar, well acquainted with verſification and poetical hiſtory; but we cannot ſay WE diſcovered in it thoſe marks of genius which have ſtruck the more delicate apprehenſion of Mr. Pratt. It is too much loaded with the verbiage of epithet. Swift did all he could to bring ſounding expletives into diſrepute; but they ſtill prevail as much as if he had not written about *Cupid's purple pinions*. Our gleaner conducts us to Rumſey, and there gives a very high character of the late Lady Palmerſton. We next are brought to the New Foreſt; and here the exquiſite taſte of Mr. Pratt finds ſuch ample ſubject for operation, that we accompany him with very great pleaſure. But this pleaſure ariſes from the works of Mr. Pratt himſelf, and not from extracts from Mr. Gilpin, or any other writer. The writings of Mr. Gilpin we read with ſatisfaction, but not at *ſecond hand*. This foreſt contains many rough and irregular characters; but we are happy to find that there are in the ſame neighbourhood many perſons of great virtues; and one family, the Earl and Counteſs of Shaftſbury and Lady Barbara, and a venerable relative, who reſides chiefly in London, *by the author's account*, poſſeſs ſuch virtues as would reflect a luſtre not only on the foreſt of Hampſhire, but on the garden of Eden.

Our author made theſe remarks in 1799; in 1804 he reviſited the ſame ſcene, and continued his obſervations on the foreſt. From Hampſhire he proceeded to Warwickſhire, and took a ſtation

very

very different from the foreſt. His view of Birmingham is very amuſing, intereſting, and inſtructive. The information reſpecting the town diſplays great induſtry of enquiry, the obſervations of a diſcriminating head, and a reſpectable knowledge of the nature and value of the objects which he exhibits. His reflections ſhew a mind in ſeveral points not incompetent to the commercial, political, and moral appreciation of the circumſtances which he is deſcribing. When he comes to Warwick caſtle he preſents a copy of verſes, which convey an happy alluſion to Guy Earl of Warwick and the Daniſh giant. Towards the end of the firſt volume, our author introduces an account of Britiſh *charities*; and though we do not exactly perceive the train of the aſſociations, by which this ſubject is introduced, and though we knew the liſt of the moſt important inſtitutions very well before, we again, with much ſatisfaction, re-echo Infant Aſylum, Magdalen Hoſpital, Marine Society, Middleſex Hoſpital, and many other names which can never be repeated, without exciting the grandeſt ideas of Britiſh benevolence. We ſhould think the critic, that would object to the repetition of ſuch a catalogue, merely becauſe it is very well known, equally faſtidious, as a critic who ſhould object to the ſound of ſuch inſpiring names as Crecy, Poictiers, and Agincourt and Blenheim, and many other ſcenes of glorious victories by land, or our ſea warfare from the Armada to the Nile; or that would object to the introduction, even unexpected, of ſuch names as Bacon and Newton, Shakeſpeare or Milton. The one claſs of names equally atteſts the national benevolence, as the firſt of the other two reflects on the national courage, warlike talents, and power; and the third on national genius and wiſdom. Enemies, therefore, though we be to compilation, we cannot object to ſuch paſſages, eſpecially in a work which does not profeſs to purſue unity of deſign, or of object.

The ſecond volume conſiſts of three productions in a dramatic form; the firſt is entitled HAIL FELLOW WELL MET, in five acts; its object is to ſhew the abſurdity, inſanity, and deſtructiveneſs of the levelling ſyſtem, which was inculcated by the French revolution. The time to which this work refers, is the cloſe of the year 1792, a few weeks before France declared war againſt Britain. The author informs us that it is the general opinion of his friends, that there could not be a more ſeaſonable time for the publication than the preſent. From this general opinion we doubt not there will be numerous diſſenters who will aſſert that Mr. Pratt attacks doctrines that are no longer of any conſequence or efficiency; we, however, are of a quite contrary opinion, and think that the inſubordination, profligacy, and impiety of jacobiniſm, are now fully as prevalent as in 1792. They do not, indeed, now operate in clubs, but in the general tranſactions of ſociety. Servants are much leſs obedient to their maſters. Journeymen ardently form combinations for commanding thoſe whom their ſtation in ſociety morally and politically obliges them to obey. The lower claſſes in general, ſuch as mechanics, retail tradeſmen, or ſhopkeepers, are much leſs reſpectful to their ſuperiors, the gentry and nobility.

There is an approach to a confuſion of ranks and diſtinctions. Evils ſo alarming to any regular and well-conſtituted government deſerve to be expoſed; and from Mr. Pratt they have received a very fair and ſevere expoſure, which diſplays a moral and political reflection, if not extremely deep, at leaſt juſt, and, indeed, obvious; and the ſharpneſs of ſarcaſtic powers directed to the very beſt purpoſe of ridicule. The ſcene is chiefly at Havre de Grace, but near the cloſe is very happily changed for the new foreſt of Hampſhire. The following are the outlines of the fable:

Sir John Aircaſtle, a gentleman of the county of Hants, in the beginning of the French revolution, ſwallowed every aſſertion, idea, and chimera, of the votaries of that change, either in France or England, as truth and Goſpel. He inculcated the ſame on his ſervants, who readily enough learned a leſſon that raiſed them to equality with their maſter. An old widow ſiſter, who had lived many years without a ſecond offer, became very much diſcontented with the conſtitution, under which men do not value the charms of old and ugly women as much as young and beautiful. The brother and ſhe abominating England, ſet out to the bleſſed land of France, there the baronet and his ſiſter endeavoured to reduce themſelves and their ſervants to a perfect equality, and for that purpoſe to aſſimilate both to the *ſans culottes*. When the play opens, they had made very great progreſs in effecting their ſcheme. Sir John had incurred great expence in the execution of this project, and was repreſented, by the friendly deception of ſome old church and king neighbours and relations, as having ruined his eſtate, unleſs he would immediately return to England. Of his ſervants, two untainted Engliſhmen were faithful to the maſter. One of theſe uſed every effort to allure Sir John to leave France, by repreſenting the iniquity of the paſſing tranſactions, and the happineſs he might ſtill enjoy in his native iſland. The other, by quoting to him his new doctrines, tried the ſame end. Steps had been purpoſely taken by his friends to ſeize the rent and moveables of his eſtate. A generous old farmer conerned for his landlord, whom, before his infection, all had loved and revered, and ſtill remembered with grateful and melancholy kindneſs, came over in a fiſhing-ſmack to offer the ſavings of a frugal and induſtrious life to relieve the wants of Sir John, and to exhort him to return to his own country. Meanwhile various circumſtances tended to increaſe the influence of ſuch friends. An entertainment was given, at which was to begin the attendance of the maſter, and wife, and daughter, on the ſervants of the kitchen. The *fete* as uſual with *ſans culottes* entertainment, produced among the revolutioniſts a ſcene of drunkenneſs and uproar, attended by the groſſeſt inſolence both to Sir John and the ladies. Two or three church and king gentlemen, relations of Sir John, and one ſuitor to his daughter, perceiving the baronet enraged by the conduct of the ſervants, widened the breach, and at length prevailed on him to agree to a flight, of which they had prepared the means. An Engliſh ſhip having been wrecked on the coaſt, had gone to the bottom. Twelve ſailors had eſcaped and reached

the

the French ſhore in the long-boat, and landed near Sir John's houſe, where they were joyfully recogniſed by the adherents of their country, who were all ſober, and not ſeen by the ſans culottes, who were all drunk. Sir John's houſe being out of town, he and his friends hurried, unobſerved, to the ſhore; theſe were no ſooner embarked, than, moſt fortunate to tell, a favourable breeze immediately blew up and conveyed them to England, where Sir John and his loyal and patriotic friends and adherents enjoyed comfort and happineſs, while the ſans culotte ſervants were left in France to enjoy the bleſſings of equality and regicide.

The purpoſe of this fable, every friend of order, civilization, virtue, and the Britiſh conſtitution, muſt approve. It clearly ſhews that men are much happier by adhering to the leſſons of experience, than by following the wild viſions of revolution. This truth, to be ſure, *is not new*, but one which is always worthy of being inculcated on the lower claſſes. We exhort the noblemen, gentlemen, and others, who keep footmen, grooms, and butlers, to circulate this play among thoſe claſſes, unleſs it ſhould have the good fortune to reach them without any ſuch auxiliary efforts. Diſtributed among the humble ranks, it will certainly do moſt important benefit, while perſons of taſte and literary talents muſt, on the whole, be pleaſed with the execution The plot, to be ſure, at leaſt the eſcape part, is ſomewhat marvellous; that a ſhip ſhould be wrecked on a coaſt of the channel has no marvel, that juſt as many ſhould be ſaved, as with Sir John's adherents could work and defend without overloading the boat, was a nicely-balanced incident. That the wind, which is ſuppoſed to have blown on a lee-ſhore when the boat was ſtranded, ſhould change to the land ſide at the very inſtant they embark, was a circumſtance beſpeaking the peculiar gift of Providence, often exerciſed in protecting the righteous. We ſhould therefore deem it extremely illiberal to make any critical cavils upon the *probability* of all theſe coincidences. We do think that the ſituation of Miſs Aircaſtle, her parents, the loyal and patriotic friends, adherents, and gallant Britiſh ſailors, were ſuch as to admit of an author to *ſtretch a point* in ſaving them; and if ſuch means of reſcue may appear doubtful to probability, they all *might have happened.* We, therefore, on the whole, approve of the plot. The characters are well drawn, well diverſified, and well adapted to the reſpective and general purpoſes. The ſentiments, language, and manners of the revolutioniſts, are ſufficiently characteriſtic. The ſentiments of the loyal and patriotic friends of England, in the various gradations, are worthy of Engliſhmen, and manifeſt the conceptions, which at once juſt and grand, our author entertains of the land, people and king of Britain. The account of the progreſs of the frenzy told by Lady Aircaſtle to a friend, illuſtrates at once the advance of revolution, and exhibits a fair and favourable ſpecimen of the compoſition. Sir Thomas Steady aſked her ladyſhip to what lengths the jacobinical fit was gone in Sir John Aircaſtle and his ſervants, to which ſhe anſwers:

Lady Aircastle. "Almoſt to our ruin; I'm aſham'd to tell you how far. He (Sir John Aircaſtle) invited his ſervants over from England; and, on the evening of their arrival, addreſſed them thus: 'I have ſent for you here to take off your fetters, to make you free men and free women, to ſhare with you my houſe and fortune, and to partake the charm and benefits of this land of liberty. Henceforth you are my brothers, equal in rank and pretenſions; I can atone for the tyranny of the paſt, only by the freedom you will enjoy in future. This is the laſt moment of your ſervitude.'

Sir Thomas. "How did they take this?

Lady Aircastle. "At firſt they ſeemed at a loſs to underſtand it; ſome thought he meant thererein a reproach for neglect, and took this for a bantering way to chide and diſmiſs them; others thought that he was gone out of his ſenſes. Not one entered into his idea, in the ſpirit of gravity with which it was broached; for though they had heard that the French were committing all manner of exceſſes about liberty, their notions were ſo confined, their fears and hate ſo ſtrong of the French themſelves, that the greateſt inſtance, perhaps, they could poſſibly give of their attachment to their maſter and the family, was truſting themſelves in this country; and, indeed, one of them (your favourite, and whoſe fidelity is ſtill uncorrupted, true Ned the butler, the honeſt fellow who has juſt left the room) repreſented that he had been the inſtigator of the ſervants undertaking the voyage, thinking the good family had got into ſome hobble in France, and might be reſcued out of the jaws of the French parlez vous, by their joint efforts, elſe he ſhould not have invited them to come over, for that he neither liked the country nor the people; and that ſo far from living amongſt them, or becoming one of their gang, he would die as he was born, a true Britiſh ſubject.

Sir Thomas. "I always remarked in that fellow one of thoſe minds and underſtandings, which preclude the neceſſity of education, to give either grace or energy to virtue. But my poor friend, how ended this folly?

Lady Aircastle. "The liberty allowed them of being uſeleſs, notwithſtanding theſe aſſurances, ſat awkward upon them a long time; they could not eaſily forget that they had been educated to induſtry, that they had long ſerved one of the beſt of maſters; or that they had derived their happineſs, no leſs than their livelihood, as a virtuous effect of thoſe honeſt cauſes. Some of them mechanically purſued the buſineſs of the day; till, in the end, the influence of ſurrounding examples, the habit of ſeeing honeſt ſervitude exchanged for rapacious indolence, or active ſeductive wickedneſs, and the frequent inſtances of violated virtue, of murdered innocence, and every other abomination againſt decency, nature, religion, and the laws, and all theſe again ſanctioned by their infatuated maſter, who, although a priſoner in his gouty chair, refuſed the leaſt ſervice, and even received the help he was obliged to accept, from Ned and the ſteward, thankleſsly, all this, I ſay, obliterated, by degrees, the ſenſe of what they ſhould be, the memory of what they had been, and reconciled them at laſt to the madneſs of the times. They are now almoſt as diſtracted, as worthleſs as Sir John wiſhes them to be.

Sir Thomas. "And this is the boaſted freedom for which ſo much treaſure has been purloined! ſo much guiltleſs blood ſhed! for which the blameleſs ruler of the realm was martyred, and his hapleſs family deſtroyed!!! Honeſt people are conſtrained to hide their affections, and their moſt honourable attachments, in holes and corners; and all the virtues of the

the land have been forced to emigrate; while under the ſpecious names of patriotiſm, heroiſm, and republicaniſm, with the majeſtic ſovereignty of the people, aſſaſſination, murder, ſacrilege, and every other crime, go free, nay, are rewarded. In the French revolution, my lady, the proverb is falſified: "A good beginning" has there degenerated in progreſs, and muſt be accurſed in the end. Let us haſten then, my friend, to the country where integrity may aſſert itſelf, and where only turpitude need to ſhun the day."

From both the quotations and remarks we have made, we doubt not that our loyal and patriotic readers will all join with us in praiſing the object and principles of the work; we alſo think, with certain limitations and exceptions, that it will be received by literary readers as a good dramatic tale. In that view we think well of it on the whole; and we declare it a really ſatisfactory proof that the genius of Mr. Pratt is ſtill undiminiſhed, and perfectly competent to efforts of originality, as ſuch would we always wiſh to receive from the pen of Mr. Pratt.

The next continuous piece that we encounter, is by no means original in ſubject, though new in plan; it is an attempt to dramatiſe the famous NUT BROWN MAID OF PRIOR. We muſt candidly tell the author, that when a work of diſtinguiſhed and admired genius comes from ſome eminent pen in a ſpecific form or ſhape, it is by no means ſafe for another to try to change that form and ſhape. If any man were to propoſe to new model Pope's Eſſay on Criticiſm, or Gulliver's Travels, we ſhould not think the attempt prudent or practicable; both have amuſed, delighted, and inſtructed the world for near a century as they are; and we doubt if any changes would make them pleaſe and inſtruct more than in the preſent arrangement. The ſame may be ſaid of Henry and Emma. Prior rendered the alleged difficulties of Henry, and the united diſintereſtedneſs, generoſity, and magnanimity of Emma, ſo ſtrikingly pictureſque and impreſſively pathetic, that no other diſpoſition could improve the ſame tale. The production diſplays taſte, fancy, and ingenuity; but the reader enters into neither, as applicable to the ſtory of Henry and Emma; and, in fact, this dramatic effuſion contains ſcarcely any of the exquiſite dialogue between the youth and the maid which Prior ſo admirably winds into the final developement.

The next performance is an extremely well-contraſted picture of exceſſive heat and exceſſive coldneſs of affection. The compared ſubjects are, an emaciated lord, and a furious Welſh baronet. Their interference, ſituation, and circumſtances, very fully illuſtrate theſe oppoſites.

With this performance, intitled Fire and Froſt, the ſecond volume concludes.

The third volume is devoted to poetry; many of the pieces are *pretty*, and ſome of them pathetic; but the volume contains, like a part of the firſt that we mentioned, a great deal too much of the panegyric, much of which the world knows very well to be exaggerated, and will not take, on Mr. Pratt's word, when contrary to fact and

eſtabliſhed

eſtabliſhed opinion; and, if they do not know the particulars, they will wait for examination. For our parts, though Mr. Pratt, in his notes to the poem of the Phyſician, introduces, in verboſe liſts, almoſt half the practitioners in town, and would make them all great men, we do not think they all are or can be great men. In every profeſſion, learned as well as unlearned, the profeſſional character is mediocrity; and the ſame may be ſaid of authors. It is vain to ſet a man down for a genius, merely becauſe he has ſcraped materials for tranſmuting even into uſeful books.

The Poet's Cottage is dedicated to Dr. Mavor, to whom the author ſeems to be indebted for friendly efforts, which the warm heart of Mr. Pratt has received with ardent gratitude. Two or three poems follow on ſeveral ſons of that gentleman. The verſes are pretty; but, as we do not know the youths in queſtion, we can be no judges of the applicability. Verſes to pictures in Warwick caſtle praiſe the paintings of that manſion as through the expreſſion ſuperior to the works of Raphael and Titian. Another poem appearing to be the production of Dr. Mavor, intitled the Counſels of Affection, diſplays taſte, virtuous and religious ſentiments, and is preſented in good verſification. Some of the other poems that follow, ſeem to turn on perſonal circumſtances, and ſome benefits received by the author. Various ſhort effuſions follow, and bring us to the event of a chancery ſuit. Mr. Anſtey, we are afraid, has ſo much exhauſted the law as a ſubject of wit and ſatire, that we do not ſoon expect future competitors who will raiſe ſuch amuſement and entertainment as proceeded from John a Gudgeon and John Gull. The Modern Hercules is a production of ingenuity, ſenſe, and reflection, in correct and fluent verſe. In a few lines are contained a handſome well-turned compliment to Mr. Phillips the bookſeller. A Soliloquy on Hampton Court, introduces an alluſion to the celebrated ſtory of Wolſey. On Dr. Thornton's Botany we have never delivered any critical opinion, and therefore ſhall not at preſent declare our acquieſcence with, or diſſent from, the author's panegyric. A poem, intitled Edward and Matilda, is a pretty enough deſcription, but deficient in ſimplicity. The Ploughman ſo Stout, of Mr. Pye, meets us with great pleaſure. We hail the vigour of genius which ſucceſsfully expoſed the abſurdity of German wonders; the playfulneſs of humour which invented at once ſo laughable and ſo probable a tale, and preſerving the imitation throughout, marked the ſtriking contraſt of improbability and probability between the fate of Alonzo and Roger. After this production of Mr. Pye, are introduced ſome pretty and pathetic poems by his daughter, who appears to have inherited the family genius. There follow ſeveral poems from Dr. Mavor, which are good compoſition and verſe, and abound in juſt moral reflections. From the poems which Dr. Mavor both receives and writes, we are led to believe he is a worthy and benevolent man. There is a poor, vulgar, contemptible joke about a Caledonian louſe, of which any reſpectable Scotchman would rather be the ſubject than the author. It is, beſides, a moſt bungling

perverſion

perverſion of Sancho Pancho's experiment in the boat on the Ebro. There is a moſt extravagant and fulſome eulogium on the Earl of Moira; certainly a benevolent, gallant, and accompliſhed nobleman, but certainly not ſuperior in talents to our leading politicians, and to the higheſt much inferior. The following poems are ſo ſhort, that they require or admit no character. The poems of M. Dallas are well compoſed, and in good verſe. In a great number of others, our author adheres to ſimilar ſhortneſs of effuſion. There is a decent eſſay on Horace's idea of a country eſtate. It is impoſſible to follow, in detail, ſuch a multiplicity of pieces; we ſhall therefore obſerve, in general, that the writers, without exhibiting in thoſe curſory eſſays, either fancy, or force, or the tenderneſs of pathos, write Engliſh verſe with fluency and accuracy. John and Dame, or England verſus Buonaparté, is very well adapted to its object, and likely to produce much good to the lower orders in the ſame way that benefit was effected by Thomas Bull to his brother John Bull, in a famous tract written in November 1792. The laſt poem is upon Sympathy, which we really have only looked over without much analyſis or eſtimate. Perhaps it may ſome time come directly before us, when it ſhall have critical juſtice. On the whole, in theſe three volumes of Mr. Pratt, by far the beſt is the ſecond; and of that the drama upon equality. The ſecond volume evinces lively genius directed to the higheſt purpoſe. The firſt abounds in important knowledge and judicious reflection. The third, being a collection from ſuch a number of hands, can have no appropriate character; and we think that beſtowing the due praiſe on various parts of the third, yet, on the whole, both in ability and intereſt, it is much inferior to the firſt and ſecond. But taking the production all in all, in its three volumes, we declare, that after charging the defects there appears to us to remain a great balance of excellencies in the Harveſt Home of Mr. Pratt; that it is worthy of its author, and abounds in pleaſure and amuſement, which are not rarely accompanied by utility and inſtruction.

Catholic Emancipation. 8vo. Pp. 59. Price 1s. 6d. Stockdale. 1805.

THIS is a very able and valuable pamphlet. The queſtion of which it treats is, undoubtedly, one of the moſt important which the peculiar circumſtances of the times preſent for the conſideration of the enlightened patriot and ſtateſman. It is not a queſtion of ſlight or temporary moment, which may be decided either way without much inconvenience; but of tranſcendent magnitude, and of permanent intereſt, the determination of which muſt affect the very fundamental principles of our venerable conſtitution, both in Church and State. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, it muſt be allowed, have, within the preſent reign, and eſpecially during the latter years of it, experienced ſingular tenderneſs and favour. They

are

are not, however, yet, it appears, contented; and nothing, it would ſeem, will ſatisfy them but a total abolition of thoſe ſalutary reſtraints which the wiſdom of our anceſtors thought indiſpenſibly neceſſary to protect the ſtability of our Proteſtant eſtabliſhments. We, for our part, take no delight in reviving unpleaſant recollections, which, we heartily wiſh, could be buried in everlaſting oblivion. But when the claims and pretenſions of any ſet of men are not only conſtant and clamorous, but boundleſs, the moſt charitable and good-natured diſpoſition may be permitted to inquire on what grounds ſuch men expect to have their claims and pretenſions acceded to. What, then, have the Roman Catholics of Ireland done to merit a farther extenſion of their privileges? Have they been, lately, diſtinguiſhed by gratitude for the favours which they have already received, by affection for their Proteſtant brethren, by attachment to their country, and by loyalty to their Sovereign? Their beſt friends will hardly venture to advance ſuch a plea in their behalf. It is natural, however, for themſelves, perhaps, to urge their demands for what they are pleaſed to call *Emancipation*, a name under which they tacitly include the whole political power of the kingdom, together with the legal eſtabliſhment of their religion, if not a complete diſſolution of their connection with the Britiſh empire. But that a party ſhould be found in the Imperial parliament who declare themſelves not only willing but forward to comply with theſe demands, may well excite a ſurprize. That the bench of biſhops, the appointed guardians of our Proteſtant Church, ſhould exhibit even a SINGLE individual of this deſcription, muſt excite aſtoniſhment. But we are not greatly alarmed on the ſubject. There yet remains in this country, among perſons of every denomination, a ſufficient portion of native good ſenſe, of patriotic concern for the proſperity of the empire, of enlightened zeal for the intereſts of the Proteſtant faith, and even of regard for the Iriſh Catholics themſelves, to prevent the ſucceſs of a meaſure which is pregnant with the moſt miſchievous and blaſting effects. The moſt exalted and venerable Perſonage in the nation is known to be decidedly againſt it. The great miniſter now at the head of his Majeſty's councils, whatever may have been, at a former period, his ſentiments with regard to it, muſt ſee it, at preſent, we are fully perſuaded, in its proper light; and he is not a man to be frightened or bullied into any meaſure which does not meet with his entire and deliberate approbation. Mr. Pitt has abundance of reaſon to know that he poſſeſſes, what he ſo well deſerves, the *confidence of the country*; a confidence of which no *petty indiſcretion or trivial miſcarriage* will ever deprive him. But he will, we feel confident, not cenſure us for reminding him, that THE SAFETY OF THE UNITED PROTESTANT CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND IS AN OBJECT OF PARAMOUNT AND ESSENTIAL IMPORTANCE, an attack upon which muſt overſet any miniſter, and might even endanger the throne. The temperate and ſenſible publication before us commences thus:

"As

"As the meaſure of Catholic Emancipation (if we may believe public report,) is to be brought forward during the preſent ſeſſion of Parliament, it would be criminal in the friends of the preſent eſtabliſhment in Church and State any longer to preſerve a prudential ſilence, and, by ſo doing, to enable miſrepreſentation, and the intrigues of party, to prevail over truth and the conſtitution."

"I ſhall not attempt to urge, to its ſupporters, the danger of agitating ſuch a queſtion in the preſent ſtate of the empire, or anticipate the immediate conſequences [which] the diſcuſſion may have upon the tranquillity of Ireland; nor ſhall I advert to the *well-known ſcruples* of a moſt exalted Perſonage upon the ſubject, becauſe I am fully aware what little effect conſiderations of delicacy or [of] policy can have upon the conduct of men, if they can be ſuppoſed to have the noble deſign in view of embarraſſing the King's government, and of alienating the minds of his Catholic ſubjects in Ireland."

"But there are, no doubt, many who have eſcaped the vortex of party, and refuſed blindly to ſubmit their underſtandings, upon ſo important a ſubject, to the ſole guidance of others. To ſuch honeſt and conſcientious men the following pages are moſt humbly ſubmitted." (Pp. 5, 6.)

The pamphlet is divided into four ſections, in the firſt of which the author ſtates his preciſe ideas of Catholic Emancipation, and of the mode by which, in his opinion, it is to be effected. Catholic Emancipation he conceives to be "a diſpenſation of thoſe who profeſs the Roman Catholic religion from the neceſſity of taking the oaths of ſupremacy and abjuration, and of making and ſubſcribing the declaration annexed to them." It includes, he thinks, "an excluſive privilege, to men of that communion, to ſit and vote in the two Houſes of Parliament, and to fill the higheſt offices of the empire, without taking thoſe TEST OATHS, which every *Proteſtant*, in England and Ireland, is now obliged to ſwear before he can become a ſenator, or fill any of the higher employments under the government." (P. 7.)

It is known to all that, in 1793, an act was paſſed in the Iriſh Parliament, which, at that time, was univerſally underſtood to have emancipated the Iriſh Catholics, by rendering them eligible to *every office*, whether civil or military, thoſe only excepted which are expreſsly ſpecified. By this act they cannot ſit or vote in either houſe of Parliament, nor can they hold or exerciſe the following truſts: thoſe of Lord Lieutenant, or other chief governor; Chancellor or Keeper; Treaſurer; Chancellor of the Exchequer; Judges; Maſter of the Rolls; Secretary of State; Privy Seal; Teller of the Exchequer, or Auditor General; Lieutenant-governor, or Cuſtos Rotulorum of counties; Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, or other chief governor; Privy Counſellor; Law Officers of the Crown; Maſters in Chancery; Provoſt or Fellow of Trinity college; Poſtmaſter-general; Maſter, and Lieutenant-general of the ordnance; Commander in chief; General on the ſtaff; Sheriffs and ſub-ſheriffs of counties; and officers in corporations. From theſe employments every perſon is excluded, "UNLESS," ſays the act, "*he ſhall have*

have taken, made and ſubſcribed the oaths and declarations, and performed the ſeveral requiſites, which by every law heretofore made, and now of force, are required to enable any perſon to ſit and vote, or to hold, exerciſe, and enjoy the ſaid offices reſpectively."

The *Emancipation* of the Iriſh Catholics, our author conceives, will be accompliſhed by a repeal of this clauſe; which will give them a diſpenſation from the neceſſity of taking the oaths, and of making and ſubſcribing the declaration contained in the Iriſh act 2d Anne, chap. 14. The *Engliſh* Catholics muſt alſo be emancipated by repealing all the diſabling ſtatutes ſtill in force againſt them. Our author is aware, he ſays, that other oaths will be framed for the Catholics. But the oaths of ſupremacy and abjuration, thoſe bulwarks of our preſent conſtitution in Church and State, muſt be diſpenſed with, if any emancipation be ſeriouſly intended. Obſerve, then, the groſs abſurdity that will follow, unleſs the oath of ſupremacy be aboliſhed altogether: "Every Proteſtant will be obliged to *ſwear*, what none of them attempt to deny, that the King is the ſupreme head of the Church as well as of the State; while every Roman Catholic in the empire will be *legalized* in his denial of the King's eccleſiaſtical ſupremacy, and exempted from all the pains and penalties of a *præmunire*, to which every Proteſtant will be ſtill left liable." (P. 11.)

"By our preſent conſtitution," ſays the author, "the Church and State are ſo inſeparably connected, that, I apprehend, it would be impoſſible to ſeparate them without deſtroying both. Indeed it has been doubted whether it be in the power of Parliament to repeal the acts of ſupremacy, any more than it could the Great Charter. Even Queen Mary (bigot and tyrant as ſhe was) did not venture to do it, but granted *diſpenſations* from the oaths enjoined by them." (Pp. 13, 14.)

It was owing to their ſenſe of the mutual dependance of the Church and State upon each other, that, at the revolution, our anceſtors carefully excluded Roman Catholics from political power, by framing the preſent oaths with ſuch preciſion of language that no ingenuity could evade them. Our anceſtors "well knew," continues this writer, "that ſincere Roman Catholics muſt prefer their own faith to the reformed; and, believing it to be the nature of man to wiſh to bring over others to his own opinions in religion and politics, they were aware that the uſe that Roman Catholics would make of power, would be to ſet up their eſtabliſhment on the ruins of proteſtantiſm. They had been taught, by woeful experience, that a prince of that perſuaſion, of moral conduct in other reſpects, and of no very mean abilities, could be induced *to break his coronation oath*, at the inſtigation of his bigotry and his father confeſſor; and, as they preferred liberty and the reformed religion to popery and arbitrary government, they determined, as far as in them lay, to take care that thoſe who, in after times, were to make laws for, and to govern their deſcendents, ſhould firſt give a pledge of their attachment to the Church

Church and the State, by a conformity to thoſe principles of religion which they conceived to be the only ſecurity for their liberties in this world, and the moſt rational mode of attaining felicity hereafter." (Pp. 14, 15.)

It was on this principle that they framed the preſent oaths of ſupremacy and abjuration, and the declaration annexed, as SOLEMN TESTS, to be required of all thoſe who were to be entruſted with the making of laws, or with the adminiſtration of the government. With theſe teſts the Engliſh advocates of the Iriſh Catholics will venture to adviſe his Majeſty and the two Houſes of Parliament *to diſpenſe*. They will venture to propoſe that to George III. which coſt James II. his crown: and to guard againſt which the preſent royal family was originally called to the throne of theſe realms.

The evil, however, will not ſtop here. The complete *emancipation* of the Proteſtant Diſſenters is neceſſarily connected with that of the Catholics. For, with what face can thoſe privileges be refuſed to the former, which are granted to the latter? "When," as our author obſerves, "the *repealers of ſtatutes* and *diſpenſers with oaths*, have removed every impediment to political power which ſtands in the way of their Catholic friends in both countries—ſurely they will not ſtop there. Upon what pretence of policy or juſtice will they ſuffer the teſt and corporation laws to exiſt in force? What have the Diſſenters *lately* done to render them unworthy of the notice of theſe philoſophical innovators? Surely, ſome liberal-minded man will riſe in Parliament, and move for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the act of 13 Charles II. ſtat. 2. cap. 1. commonly called the Corporation Act: the 25 Car. II. cap. 2. commonly called the Teſt Act: that clauſe of 7 and 8 Will. III. cap. 34. which provides that no Quaker ſhall have any office or place of profit under the government: 5 Geo I. cap. 4. and that part of 19 Geo. III. which relates to endowed ſchools and colleges." (Pp. 16, 17.)

To ſuch philoſophical innovators, and philanthropic diſpenſers with oaths which form the barriers of our preſent conſtitution, our author, with great propriety, recommends the following admirable reflections by Dr. South.

"Some, indeed, account it the very ſpirit of policy and prudence, where men refuſe to come up to a law, *to make the law come down to them*, and, for their ſo doing, have this infallible recompence, that they are not at all the more loved, but much the leſs feared, and, which is a ſure conſequence of it, accordingly *reſpected*. But, believe it, it is a reſolute tenacious adherence to well-choſen principles, that adds glory to greatneſs, and makes the face of a governor ſhine in the eyes of thoſe who ſee and examine his actions. *Diſobedience, if complied with, is infinitely encroaching, and, having gained one degree of liberty upon indulgence, will demand another upon claim.* (Pp. 17, 18.)

The truth of this maxim was never more completely illuſtrated than in the conduct of the Roman Catholics of theſe kingdoms. The ſecond ſection of this pamphlet proves, from our hiſtory, the impoſſibility

impoſſibility that Roman Catholics and Proteſtants can agree together in the adminiſtration of political power. The aſcendancy of one party *muſt* be eſtabliſhed by the downfall of the other. Queen Mary had re-eſtabliſhed the maſs, dropt her title of head of the Church, and reſtored the Catholic biſhops and clergy. But her two firſt parliaments prevented the full ſucceſs of her deſigns. They were, therefore, diſſolved; and, by the zeal of the Catholics, the influence of Spaniſh gold, the power of prerogative, and the intrigues of courtiers, a compliant Houſe of Commons was returned. This parliament repealed all the ſtatutes enacted in prejudice of the Church of Rome; enabled the Queen to diſpenſe with the ſtatute of *proviſors*, and to receive a legate from the pope, who received the kingdom again into the boſom of that Church; and, finally, they revived all the former ſanguinary laws againſt heretics. "Inſtantly," ſays Hume, "the rage of religious perſecution was let looſe, and England was filled with ſcenes of horror, which have ever ſince rendered the Catholic religion the object of general deteſtation, and which prove that no human depravity can equal revenge and cruelty, covered with the mantle of religion."

During the reign of Elizabeth, Papiſts were excluded from political power by the oath of ſupremacy, enacted in her ſecond year. She appeared, however, much leſs diſpoſed to treat her Catholic ſubjects with rigour, than anxious to keep a ſtrict watch over the Puritans. Yet the plots and conſpiracies againſt her life and government, fomented by the Catholic clergy, were almoſt innumerable both in England and in Ireland. The people were taught, by their prieſts, and particularly by the Jeſuits, to believe that to deprive an heretical queen of her crown and life would be meritorious in the ſight of God. It was the knowledge of this implicit belief which covered the ſeas with the Spaniſh *Armada*. "And a conviction," our author pertinently obſerves, "of the exiſtence of ſimilar opinions, *at this moment*, among the maſs of the common people in Ireland, may now determine *Bonaparte* [Buonaparté], '*the beloved ſon in Chriſt of his preſent holineſs*, to bend all his forces againſt that part of the empire, with the hope of ſucceſs, by means of the aſſiſtance of the ſame pious agency." (P. 22.)

The Catholics had formed high expectations from the acceſſion of James I. who, they flattered themſelves, had derived from his mother a cordial attachment to the Church of Rome. But though James enforced no rigorous meaſures againſt the Catholics, whom he even preferred to places of truſt and profit, they were diſappointed in their views of complete aſcendancy. They, therefore, hatched the Gunpowder Plot: "an event," as Hume very juſtly deſcribes it, "one of the moſt memorable which hiſtory has conveyed to poſterity, and containing at once a ſingular proof of the ſtrength and weakneſs of the human mind; its wideſt departure from morals, and moſt ſteady attachment to religious prejudices."

Our author purſues his hiſtorical deduction through the reigns of the

the three laſt princes of the houſe of Stuart; but the events are ſo well and ſo generally known that we do not think it neceſſary to accompany him. The proceedings, however, of James II. in Ireland, in which kingdom he entirely threw off the maſk, form ſo ſtriking an illuſtration of our author's argument, that they muſt not be ſuppreſſed. James inveſted the Catholics with the whole power of the ſtate. He gave the Iriſh a Catholic lord lieutenant, with a Catholic commander of the forces, and a Catholic chancellor. The army was immediately filled with Catholic officers, and the courts with Catholic judges. Catholic ſheriffs were appointed for every county and city of the kingdom; and a Houſe of Commons was returned in which there were but *ſix Proteſtant members*. "This Houſe of Commons repealed the acts of *ſettlement and explanation*, under which all the Proteſtant landed property was then and is ſtill held; *attainted by name two thouſand four hundred and ſixty-one Proteſtants of rank and conſequence*; and, not very long after, this Houſe of Commons *repealed the act of Henry VIII. which annexes Ireland to the crown of Great Britain.*"

"In England," continues our author, "the oppoſition which James met with from his Proteſtant parliament, and the odium which his *diſpenſing with oaths* and *teſts* had excited againſt him, produced an univerſal confederacy among his Proteſtant ſubjects; and this unhappy prince, abandoned by his nobles and abhorred by his people, deſerted by his army and forſaken by his own family, was forced to abdicate the throne of his anceſtors—*which* WILLIAM *and the ancestor of the preſent royal family were invited to occupy*, WITH THE EXPRESS STIPULATION THAT THEY WOULD UPHOLD THE PROTESTANT RELIGION, AND MAINTAIN THE FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF THIS KINGDOM." The inference which our author draws from his hiſtorical deduction is too well founded to admit of contradiction; and it ſuggeſts the moſt important practical leſſon to THOSE WHOSE PROSPECTS ARE YET IN REVERSION. . . . . "A KING OF ENGLAND, IF HE WOULD REIGN IN THE HEARTS OF HIS PEOPLE, MUST SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTION IN CHURCH AS WELL AS IN STATE." (P. 32.)

Our author proceeds, in his third ſection, to ſtate ſome of thoſe acknowledged doctrines of the Romiſh Church, which render men of that communion ſo hoſtile to every other religious eſtabliſhment. The firſt is the doctrine of implicit faith in the Church, and of blind ſubmiſſion to her deciſions. This tenet ſubjects the ignorant laity to the deſpotic power of their prieſts, of whom they are the ready tools for the moſt immoral purpoſes. "A Spaniſh grandee having complained to the father confeſſor of a queen of Spain that he did not pay him the reſpect due to his rank and nobility: 'It is not I,' replied the prieſt, 'who owe reſpect to you, but you to me, who have every day your God in my hand, and your Queen at my feet." (P. 34.)

The ſecond is the doctrine of excluſive ſalvation, which generates in every ſincere Roman Catholic, a reſtleſs zeal for making proſelytes, becauſe he looks on all without the pale of his Church as in the high

and certain road to damnation. The influence of this principle the author illuſtrates by the well-known ſtory of the late Lord Dunboyne. "In Butler's Catechiſm, the one at this day taught to the Iriſh Roman Catholics, and in the 11th leſſon on *the true Church*, it is ſaid, '*there is no other true Church but the Roman Catholic*'—and, '*no one can be ſaved out of it.*" (P. 35.)

The third tenet to which our author adverts is *the ſupremacy of the Pope*. In Roman Catholic ſtates this tenet is not ſo dangerous. But, in Proteſtant ſtates, it puts the Catholic clergy beyond the controul of the eſtabliſhed government. Both biſhops and prieſts derive their authority from the Pope, and, at their conſecration or ordination, take an oath to obey his commands; which oath directly leads them to attempt the overthrow of every different religion. Hence the acknowledged doctrines of the Romiſh Church, *that no faith is to be kept with heretics*; *that oaths to an heretical ſtate are not binding*; *that it is not only lawful, but an imperious duty, to oppoſe heretical princes, and overturn heretical governments*; *and that all decrees of general councils, approved and confirmed by the Pope, are to be received as unerring and infallible rules of both faith and morals.*

"I ſhall here," ſays our ingenious author, "be told that the Engliſh and Iriſh Roman Catholics have renounced their doctrines; but I deny the fact. The leading lay Roman Catholics of England and Ireland did, I grant, renounce the moſt objectionable of theſe tenets of their faith. But I do inſiſt that there never has been any ſolemn, univerſal, renunciation of theſe opinions by the Roman Catholic clergy of England and Ireland. *They could not renounce them without ceaſing to be Roman Catholics.*" "But ſo far have this claſs of men (whoſe powerful influence over their flocks, particularly in Ireland, will not be denied,) been from renouncing theſe doctrines, that, when the leading *lay* Catholics of England, with Lords Stourton and Petre at their head, upon their application to parliament in 1791, drew up a *declaration* of their principles, and a *proteſtation* againſt the moſt obnoxious and dangerous doctrines of their faith, and framed an oath, which they were ready to take as a ſolemn declaration of the *modern* faith of Catholics; the *Vicars Apoſtolic* of England, viz. Charles biſhop of Rama, William biſhop of Acanthus, and John biſhop of Centuria, addreſſed an exhortation 'to all the clergy and laity of their reſpective diſtricts,' condemning the oath, and the whole proceedings. "We declare," ſay theſe fathers, "that the aſſembly of the Catholic committee has no right or authority to determine on the lawfulneſs of oaths, declarations, or other inſtruments whatſoever concerning doctrinal matters; but that this authority reſides in the biſhops, they being, by divine inſtitution, the ſpiritual governors in the Church of Chriſt, and the guardians of religion. . . . *We condemn, in the fulleſt manner*, THE ATTEMPT *of offering to parliament an oath including doctrinal matters.*" (Pp. 37—40.)

In confirmation of his reaſoning our able author puts a caſe which comes directly to the point. "Suppoſe," he ſays, "thirty or forty noblemen and gentlemen induced, for a political purpoſe, to ſign a declaration againſt every one of *the Thirty-nine Articles*; would it thence

thence be inferred that the whole body of the Proteſtant clergy, and every other member of the Church of England, had conſented to abjure theſe articles of our faith? And, moreover, if our archbiſhops and biſhops had made a ſolemn proteſtation againſt this proceeding, would any perſon of common ſenſe inſiſt that the declaration of theſe thirty or forty noblemen and gentlemen was to be conſidered as the unanimous opinion of all the Proteſtants of England? The Roman Catholic lords and gentlemen of England, who formed the Catholic committee in 1791, (I ſpeak of them with great reſpect,) were men who, ſoaring above the prejudices of their early education, *became Catholics upon ceaſing to be Papiſts.*" (Pp. 40, 41.)

Undoubtedly, while the Church of Rome adheres to her claim of infallibility, no tenet which ſhe has ever embraced can be afterwards relinquiſhed. Accordingly Mr. Plowden ingenuouſly owns "that, if any one ſays or pretends to inſinuate, that the modern Catholics, who are the late object of the bounty of Parliament, *differ in one iota from their anceſtors*, he either deceives himſelf, or he wiſhes to deceive others. *Semper eadem* is more emphatically deſcriptive of our religion than of our juriſprudence." Dr. Troy, the preſent popiſh archbiſhop of Dublin, has *expreſsly declared*, in a paſtoral letter 1793, "*that the religious opinions of the Roman Catholics are unchangeable; that the Church of Rome is infallible in her doctrinal deciſions and canons on points of faith and morals; and that, therefore, Catholics are obliged to adhere implicitly to ſuch decrees and canons of the Church, aſſembled in general councils, and confirmed by the Pope, as rules of faith.*"

"I am informed," ſays our author, "that there are, at this moment, in Ireland 2300 Roman Catholic eccleſiaſtics, perfectly independent of the government, moſt of them men educated in a foreign country, acknowledging and obeying a foreign juriſdiction, looking up to a foreign power for their advancement, and depending upon voluntary contribution for their bread; attached to the government under which they live by no bonds of intereſt, duty, or affection to ſociety; by none of thoſe endearing ties which controul ordinary men in their conduct, and which even check thoſe of the moſt daring minds in their projects of unlawful ambition, by the dread leſt their failure ſhould entail reproach and poverty upon their children and dependents."

"Such has been the condition of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland ſince the days of Elizabeth; and the conſequence has been, that ſuch numbers of them have openly appeared in, or ſecretly abetted, every conſpiracy and rebellion which *has* [have] afflicted Ireland from that day, down to the eventful times in which we live." (Pp. 43—45.)

Our author's laſt ſection is intended to prove that "Catholic emancipation will produce Catholic aſcendancy in Ireland;" and he has proved it completely. The repreſentatives of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament (12 or 13 excepted) are all returned by a popular election. The majority of the electors, (with the exception of

the four great Proteſtant counties of Armagh, Antrim, Londonderry, and Down), are Roman Catholics; of whom a large proportion conſiſts of forty ſhilling freeholders of the loweſt order of the people. While Roman Catholics are excluded from Parliament, theſe electors will vote, in general, with the perſons on whom they chiefly depend: for all Proteſtant candidates are, in their eyes, equal. But when, by a repeal of the preſent oaths, or a diſpenſation from taking them, Roman Catholic candidates ſhall be entitled to offer themſelves, it is folly to ſuppoſe that the electors will not chooſe them.

"We know, by experience, that, in the laſt Iriſh Parliament which ſat in the reign of James II. Roman Catholics were returned for every county and city in the kingdom, *excepting three*; and, whenever they ſhall be again *emancipated*, it is a fair preſumption that the great majority of the repreſentatives of Ireland will be Roman Catholics; unleſs we are to conclude that the conceſſion of this privilege in their favour will deprive them of all deſire to reap the fruits of it, and that *Catholic emancipation* will work the miracle of extinguiſhing thoſe great and ruling paſſions of the human mind—ambition, and the luſt of power." (Pp. 48, 49.)

An act of parliament was paſſed, on the reſtoration, for the *ſettlement* of Ireland. Some doubts having ariſen on the conſtruction of this act, another was paſſed, about three years after, which is uſually called *the Act of Explanation*. By this laſt act the then lord lieutenant was empowered to make rules for the better regulating of all cities, walled towns, and corporations, and for electing their magiſtrates and officers. Theſe rules, when enrolled in the chancery, were to be as binding in law as if made by act of parliament. Accordingly a ſett of NEW RULES AND REGULATIONS, as they were called, were drawn up by the Duke of Ormond and the Privy Council, which were then declared, and have ſince continued, to form the conſtitution of all the corporations of Ireland.

By theſe *rules and regulations* no perſon can hold the office of a mayor, or any other office in corporations, who ſhall not previouſly have taken the oaths of ſupremacy and allegiance, beſide the oaths uſually taken on admiſſion to ſuch offices. Though, therefore, ſince the paſſing of the Iriſh act 33 Geo. III. c. 21, Roman Catholics can vote as *freeholders* at elections, they cannot vote as *freemen* either for a member of parliament, or for a magiſtrate or other officer in a corporation, without taking the ſame oaths as their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects. And as one of theſe oaths is the oath of ſupremacy which they refuſe to take, the corporations have continued Proteſtant, and contributed to counterbalance, by their influence, the weight of the Roman Catholics in the kingdom.

"But whenever," ſays our author, "the preſent conſtitution of the corporation of Ireland ſhall be violated by *a diſpenſation* from the oath of ſupremacy in favour of the Roman Catholics, immediately the Roman Catholics, by their numbers, wealth, and influence in the ſeveral corporate towns and cities of Ireland, will overbear the Proteſtant minority, by crouding

crouding into the corporations, and out-voting the Proteſtants; and, as upon every annual election for city-officers, members of guilds, &c. &c. &c. they will naturally ſupport the candidate of their own religion and party, the Proteſtants of Ireland will ſoon be *ouſted* from all the corporations, and Roman Catholic mayors, ſheriffs, common-councilmen, &c. &c. &c. in future be elected for thoſe towns. . . . . What a ſcene of mutual ſtrife, jealouſy, and religious animoſity will ariſe in the mean time! . . . . Will the colliſion of parties and intereſts that muſt take place, during the ſtruggle for power, calm the religious animoſities of either party? . . . . Are ſuch to be the fruits of this great meaſure for *tranquillizing Ireland?* TRANQUILLIZING IRELAND!!!" (Pp. 54—56.)

We copy entire our authors impreſſive recapitulatory concluſion; and we call upon every one of our readers, by the duty which he owes to his King and Country, to weigh it with the moſt ſerious deliberation.

"The Iriſh Roman Catholics, ſince the Iriſh act 33 Geo. III. enjoy an equal ſhare of *civil liberty* with their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, and are exempted from all thoſe diſabilities to which their Roman Catholic brethren in England are ſtill liable.

"Parliament cannot, in juſtice or policy, admit Roman Catholics to a full ſhare of *the political powers of the ſtate*, and continue to ſubject the whole body of *the Diſſenters* to the diſabilities [which] they at preſent lie under. Neither *Roman Catholics* nor *Diſſenters* can obtain the ſame political power as *the Church of England men*, except by *the repeal* of the preſent TESTS, OATHS, and LAWS, or by *a diſpenſation* from the neceſſity of taking them to qualify for the higher employments of the ſtate."

"The *repeal* of, or a *diſpenſation* from, theſe *teſts*, *oaths*, and *laws*, is a direct violation of the principles of the Revolution in 1688, and a ſubverſion of our *preſent* conſtitution, which our Monarch, at his coronation, has ſworn to uphold and preſerve."

"Roman Catholics and Proteſtants have never yet agreed, either in England or Ireland, in adminiſtering together the powers of government; nor is it poſſible that they ever can agree together, from the nature of the principles and doctrines of the Church of Rome, and the mutual jealouſy [which] they entertain of each other."

"Theſe doctrines and principles of the Church of Rome have never been diſclaimed by the great body of the Roman Catholics of England and Ireland; and that they flouriſh in full vigour, at this day, in one part of the empire, the events of the Iriſh rebellion in 1798, and the daily occurrences which take place in Ireland, unequivocally prove."

"The power of the court of Rome is, at this day, as implicitly acknowledged in Ireland, as at any former period of the hiſtory of that country; nor will the re-eſtabliſhment of the order of the Jeſuits weaken the authority of the Pope. *Neither has the coronation of the French Uſurper by his Holineſs leſſened the ſanctimonious reſpect entertained for his dignity, by the maſs of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.*"

"Catholic emancipation will put the Roman Catholics of Ireland in complete poſſeſſion of political aſcendancy, and entirely ſubvert the Proteſtant or Engliſh intereſt in that kingdom."

"Finally, let us never forget that our wiſe anceſtors (even without the awful example of the French revolution before their eyes,) were cautious

how they tried innovations in government. Let us keep in mind that they never indulged the theoretical hope of gaining over a diſcontented party, in the ſtate, by timidly yielding to their claims; and never were guilty of diſguſtiug their tried and firm ſupporters, by hazardous experiments to conciliate their opponents. But, by manfully meeting the dangers with which they were conſtantly ſurrounded, they ſecured the confidence of their friends, and, while they appalled their adverſaries, extorted their reſpect."

"If, in the inſcrutable decrees of Providence, it be ordained that the venerable fabric of the conſtitution which our anceſtors have raiſed muſt, at length, fall, let us, at leaſt, have the conſolation to reflect that we ourſelves have not, by ſhaking the pillars, accelerated its deſtruction." (Pp. 57—59.)

POLITICS.

A few Remarks on a Pamphlet, publiſhed by ſome Individuals, ſuppoſed to be connected with the late Board of Admiralty, entitled "Obſervations on the conciſe Statement of Facts, privately circulated by Sir Home Popham," &c. *In which the Calumnies of thoſe Writers are examined and expoſed; together with Strictures on the Reports of the Navy and Victualling Boards; on ſome Proceedings of the late Admiralty, not generally promulgated; Hints on the Effects of the late Experiments againſt the Enemy's Flotilla, &c.* By Æſchines. 8vo. Pp. 60. 2s. Sold by all the Bookſellers. 1805.

IN a preliminary advertiſement the author tells us that he has been reduced to the neceſſity of leaving his pamphlet in a mutilated ſtate, from the apprehenſions which the Printers have entertained, ſince ſome late trials for libels. And, to ſay the truth, theſe apprehenſions are not ill-founded; for there certainly has been a manifeſt determination on the part of ſome *Whigs* of the late miniſtry to impoſe unuſual reſtrictions on the Preſs—ſuch reſtrictions as would render it highly dangerous to diſcuſs, with freedom, the public characters of public men. We admit, that there is a great deal of prudence and of policy in ſuch determination; for unqueſtionably there is no public character likely to be ſo much injured by that free inveſtigation which leads to a full expoſure of defects, as the one with whom originated the hopeful project of ſilencing diſcuſſion by proſecutions. Having no inclination, however, to become the object of ſuch proſecutions ourſelves, we ſhall be very brief in our account of the remarks before us. Of the tract to which they profeſs to be an anſwer we know nothing but from the extracts which are here given from it. As far as we can judge from them, the ſtrong cenſures of Æſchines are eminently juſt; and the treament which Sir Home Popham has experienced is moſt tyrannical and unjuſt. Of that treatment, the following fact, the only one which we can venture to quote, is no bad ſpecimen.

"It appears, by a letter from Colonel Harneſs, publiſhed by order of Marquis Wellesley, that, from the excellent ſtate of the Romney's boats, and the ſpirited aſſiſtance of her crew, upwards of four hundred troops were ſaved from the Calcutta, which was wrecked in the Red Sea; but how muſt the feelings of the Britiſh public be ſhocked, when they learn that it was the intention of the late Board, to make this gallant officer *pay for the boat*, by which theſe brave fellows were preſerved, becauſe ſhe

was

was not conformable to the eſtabliſhment of the navy! and the ſame advantage was intended to be taken of him, with reſpect to any improvements he had made in the ſails and rigging!"

If this be a fact, it is "a damning fact" indeed. But we dare not proceed; though an admirable proof of the capacity of the late admiralty for *reforming abuſes* is preſented in P. 47; which we would fain lay before our readers; we muſt refer them, however, to the tract itſelf, the author of which has more ſpirit than prudence, and is *a very bold man* indeed!

Thoughts on Coalitions, with a Reference to the preſent State of Parties. 8vo. Pp. 116. Ginger. 1805.

THE author of this tract, which is written with conſiderable ability, and with an equal portion of ſpirit and of temper, takes a very full, and a very juſt, view of the principle and nature of political coalitions, in general; and of that coalition which has recently taken place between what has been called the *new* and the *old* oppoſition, in particular. He draws alſo a very proper diſtinction, between *reconciliation* and *coalition*, applying the former as characteriſtic of the union between Mr. Pitt and Lord Sidmouth, and the latter as deſcriptive of the junction between Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville. In the courſe of this diſcuſſion a view is taken of the political principles and conduct of Mr. Fox, as forcibly delineated, at various times, in Mr. Cobbett's Political Regiſter; and that delineation is contraſted with ſome ſubſequent eulogies of Mr. Fox, in that ſame publication. Of the author's manner, and mode of argument, the following paſſage will ſuffice as a ſpecimen.

"It was *on December* 4, 1802 *(about two years ago)* that Mr. Cobbett, in a letter ſubſcribed with his own name, reminds Mr. Fox of the tranſactions of that day. After many expoſtulations, of different ſorts, we come to this paſſage: 'Where, I pray you, Sir, ſhall I look for a proof of your diſlike to the rebels, the traitors, the regicides, and the would-be regicides of England and Ireland? Shall I find it in your *loathſome calumnies of the houſe of Stuart*, in your miſerable attempt to defend the characters of Ruſſel and Sidney, in *your* teſtimony at Maidſtone, or in your ſilence at the time *of the mutiny in the fleet?* Where, where, Sir, ſhall I find, in all the cumbrous volumes of harangues, which you have uttered during the laſt *ten years of treaſons and conſpiracies againſt the throne and life of your Sovereign*, where ſhall I find one ſingle ſentence or phraſe expreſſive of your abhorrence of theſe diabolical machinations? Will you refer me to *your ſpeech at the Shakeſpeare tavern on the* 10*th of October* 1801? 'The peace is glorious to France and TO THE FIRST CONSUL, and *I rejoice at it*. We have *not* gained the object of the war, and I like the peace *ſo much the better*. France has ſet an example which will be highly uſeful to all the nations of the earth, and, above all, to GREAT BRITAIN. I fear that, from the nature of the conteſt in which you have been engaged, you may have contracted principles of admiration for unlimited monarchy, but *the peace, followed up by a good underſtanding between the two countries*, will do them away. I hope we ſhall return to the *temper* which we were in when *we* CASHIERED *one King*, and elected another.'— 'Theſe words were, if we believe Mr. Cobbett, ſpoken in October 1801, and repeated by him in December 1802; not *a twelvemonth before the coalition between Mr. Fox and*

Mr. Windham, and leſs than *five months* before that coalition was called for in the Political Regiſter!!"

"Here it ſo happens that I am able to fortify Mr. Cobbett with the authority of another branch of the party. On the 3d of November, Lord Temple expreſſed himſelf to this effect in the Houſe of Commons: '*He who ſhould declare his pleaſure at the peace, becauſe it was glorious to the enemy*, was not THE CONNECTION THAT HE SHOULD COURT; *it was a ſentiment which could not dignify the patriot or the Engliſhman.* HE SHOULD SHRINK FROM IT WITH ABHORRENCE. *The man who employed it* SHOULD BE CAREFULLY AVOIDED, and *his principles guarded againſt.*'

"Within one year, 'one little year,' after this ſpirited declaration, was his Lordſhip cloſely connected with the man who had done this!"

At the cloſe of his comments on this ſtrange inconſiſtency, in reſpect of Mr. Fox, the author reduces Mr. Cobbett to a dilemma, from which he will find, we ſuſpect, conſiderable difficulty in extricating himſelf. He there quotes Mr. Windham's very juſt remark on Mr. Fox's ſpeech of May 4th, 1803, on the renewal of the war. "*He had not words to expreſs, in terms ſufficiently ſtrong, the wickedneſs of that honourable member's ſpeech. He had made himſelf a pander to the loweſt and baſeſt paſſions of the loweſt and vileſt of mankind.*"

But, in a note to line 100, of theſe thoughts, he imputes the memorable expreſſion, "Periſh our commerce, and live our conſtitution," to Mr. Windham, whereas it was uttered by Mr. George Hardinge. We were rather ſurprized at ſuch a miſtake in a writer who ſeems to be ſo cloſe a political obſerver, and ſo generally accurate in his ſtatements and remarks.

Letter to a learned Lord upon the abſolute Neceſſity of placing the literal Diſcuſſion of Political Subjects (thoſe of Members of Parliament excepted) *unaer an* IMPRIMATUR; *and expoſing the Proſtigacy, Temerity, and dangerous Tendency of that peſt to the Engliſo Nation—a profeſſed Political Scribbler.* By Diogenes. 8vo. Pp. 72. 3s. Egerton, Hatchard, and Ginger. 1805.

An Analytical Review of various Libels, Public, Private, Seditious, and Treaſonable; publiſhed by Cotin ſince the Publication of thoſe of which he was convicted in June laſt. ſelected from his Weekly Pamphlet. By Diogenes. Pp. 142. 2s. Egerton, &c. 1805.

THESE being parts of the ſame publication, which is yet unfiniſhed, we have claſſed them together. As to the notable project for placing an *imprimatur* on the literary productions of Engliſhmen, we truſt we ſhall never live to ſee it realized. The *policy of prevention*, indeed, in matters of general police, is a moſt wiſe policy which our government and our laws moſt ſedulouſly encourage and promote. But the law of libels is, and moſt properly, in our eſtimation, ſpecially excepted from the general application of this rule, though unqueſtionably the preſs has become a moſt powerful political engine, infinitely more powerful, and infinitely more formidable, than it ever was at any previous period of which hiſtory takes cognizance; though to that, principally, we aſcribe the ſubverſion of the throne and of the altar, and the eradication of all religious and moral principle from the minds of the people in France; though, in ſome parts of the laſt fifteen years, it has been devoted to the ſame purpoſe in this country; and though we feel that its licentiouſneſs will prove more deſtructive

ſtructive of its freedom, than any other operative cauſe, yet ſtill there is a legal remedy for the ſuppreſſion of this evil, which, properly applied, would ſcarcely fail to remove it; and till its inefficacy be proved by repeated failures, which is not likely to be the caſe, we truſt no encroachment whatever will be made on the freedom of the preſs, as exiſting in theſe happy realms, ſubject to fixed and adequate reſtrictions. There is not, indeed, the ſmalleſt reaſon whatever for ſuppoſing that proſecutions for libels, when ſupported by legal proof, will fail to produce the deſired effect. And very little attention muſt that man have paid to the proceedings of our courts of juſtice during the laſt three years, who can maintain that there exiſts the leaſt ground for ſuch a ſuppoſition. Nay, we will go farther, without the dread of contradiction from any lawyer in the land, we will aſſert, that if the law of libels were to be rigidly enforced, and carried to its utmoſt legal extent, as defined by all writers of note upon the ſubject, and as clearly laid down and applied by the moſt learned and moſt able of our judges, at different periods, and on different occaſions, it would be impoſſible, without a certainty of incurring puniſhment, to enter upon any political diſcuſſions whatever, except on general principles; or upon any diſcuſſions of a perſonal nature. The moderation and good ſenſe of the government and of the public, have happily proved an efficient corrective of the ſeverity of the law; and, we hope, that we ſhall never witneſs an attempt to ſupply any other corrective. The freedom of the preſs is a gift too precious, a privilege too valuable, a right too ſacred, to be trifled with on any account; and we are indebted to it for bleſſings of too great magnitude, to allow it to be ſubjected to the capricious and fantaſtical ſpeculations of every idle innovator. Blackſtone has ſo well expreſſed our notions on this ſubject, that we ſhall tranſcribe the paſſage.

"The liberty of the preſs is eſſential to the nature of a free ſtate; but this conſiſts in laying no *previous* reſtraints upon publications, and not in freedom for cenſure from criminal matter when publiſhed. Every freeman has an undoubted right to lay what ſentiments he pleaſes before the public: to forbid this, is to deſtroy the freedom of the preſs; but if he publiſhes what is improper, miſchievous, or illegal, he muſt take the conſequence of his own temerity. To ſubject the preſs to the reſtrictive power of a licenſer, as was formerly done, both before and ſince the revolution, is to ſubject all freedom of ſentiment to the prejudices of one man, and make him the arbitrary and infallible judge of all controverted points in learning, religion, and government. But to puniſh (as the law does at preſent) any dangerous or offenſive writings, which, when publiſhed, ſhall, on a fair and impartial trial, be adjudged of a pernicious tendency, is neceſſary for the preſervation of peace and good order, of government and religion, the only ſolid foundations of civil liberty. Thus the will of individuals is ſtill left free; the abuſe only of that will is the object of legal puniſhment. Neither is any reſtraint truly laid upon freedom of thought or inquiry. Liberty of private ſentiment is ſtill left; the diſſeminating, or making public, of bad ſentiments, deſtructive of the ends of ſociety, is the crime which ſociety corrects *."

Upon what principle this writer could think of excepting *members of par-*

* Blackſtone's Commentaries, Vol. IV. Pp. 151, 152.

leament

liament from the operation of an imprimatur, we really cannot conjecture. Freedom of *ſpeech*, to a greater extent than is allowed to any other deſcription of ſubjects, it is certainly neceſſary for the wiſeſt purpoſes of civil policy, that they ſhould enjoy; but why they ſhould be allowed to monopolize the freedom of the *preſs*, it is ſcarcely poſſible, we think, for any rational being to imagine.

Theſe tracts, eſpecially the firſt, are copiouſly interlarded with ſcraps of Greek, Latin, Italian, and French, and diſplay a wonderful waſte of learning, ſuch as it is. We ſhall not attempt to analyſe them, for much as we differ from the object of the author's attacks, in his *preſent* political principles and opinions, ſuch as they appear at leaſt, in his publications, we cannot but ſtrongly reprobate ſuch aſſaults upon him as theſe. To convict an author of inconſiſtency, contradiction, and abandonment of principle, by fair argument and plain proof, and to draw even ſtrong deductions from facts previouſly eſtabliſhed, (ſuch as are drawn by the judicious author of the "Thoughts" reviewed in the preceding article,) is to do no more than that which every public writer has a legitimate right to do, and to which every author is fairly expoſed. But to ſay that a man deſerves to *be hanged*, that he is a *villain*, and that he *does not teach his children to ſay their prayers;* and to conſign him at once to *the devil*, is to deal forth the moſt malignant abuſe, which nothing could juſtify, and which, even were it as true, as in the preſent inſtance it is falſe, inſtead of ſerving muſt injure the cauſe of truth. To return quotation for quotation: Non tali auxilio, nec defenſoribus iſtius, tempus eget. Whatever the preſent politics of the individual in queſtion may be, his character as a parent and a huſband has been eſtabliſhed beyond confutation on the moſt reſpectable authority, in a court of juſtice. Beſides, what right has any man to meddle with the private character, or domeſtic concerns of a public writer? Any ſuch *inquiſitorial* attempt we ſhall ever condemn as intolerable, by whomever, or againſt whomever, it may be directed. The writings of a man are fair objects of attack; and arguments are fair weapons to uſe. But his private conduct, and the management of his family, are no fit ſubjects for public inquiry or diſcuſſion; and abuſe is not the weapon of a man. There are other points, too, on which we differ, *toto cælo*, from Diogenes; for inſtance, he abuſes his opponent for inſerting a letter, in his publication, in praiſe of what he is pleaſed to denominate "the horrid barbarous traffic of human fleſh;" that is, the ſlave-trade. Now, though we are of opinion that the diſcuſſions on this trade (which in our younger days, before our judgment was ripened, and without a proper inveſtigation of the ſubject, we, alſo, haſtily and inconſiderately condemned) have been productive of much good, by bringing about many proper and ſalutary regulations in the conduct of it; yet, on the other hand, they have certainly done harm, by inſtilling falſe hopes into the minds of the negroes in the Weſt Indies; and, farther, we think it no difficult matter to defend the trade, on the ground not merely of *policy*, but of *humanity*. Again, he abuſes his opponent for attacking "the memory of *the great Waſhington*," and declares that the memory of the dead ought to be *reſpected*. According to this logic, the memory of Robeſpierre, and of every other regicide, ſhould be reſpected! Away with the Pagan maxim, "de mortuis nil niſi *bonum*," which would deprive hiſtory of half its uſe and advantages, and let us ſubſtitute a more Chriſtian maxim in its place: "De mortuis nil niſi *verum*." Has this writer forgotten, too, that the *great Waſhington* was a *great rebel?* Or is the hiſtorian to be deemed a libeller who marks the rebel with his re-

pro-

probation? Forbid it loyalty, forbid it truth! Let it not be ſuppoſed, however, that we approve the *application* of the paſſage in which this cenſure of Waſhington is contained; on the contrary, we freely concur with the writer in the Morning Poſt, againſt whom it is levelled.

In reſpect of the alleged libel upon our countrywomen, adverted to in p. 136 of the ſecond tract, we certainly ſo far agree with the writer of it, as to think the epithets "*foul*, *unnatural*, and *deteſtable*," fairly applicable to ſuch women as marry *black* men; and, for our part, we heartily wiſh (for reaſons too long to detail here) that no black man was ſuffered to ſettle in this country. We do not like to ſee the fair perſons of our countrywomen ſo horribly profaned, nor a mongrel race eſtabliſhed in our native land. Providence evidently deſigned them for a different climate; and there, in the name of decency, let them remain. The remarks of the writer in queſtion, are certainly too general, becauſe, thank Heaven! the practice is not ſo common as he appears to think it is; and they may alſo be conſidered as too ſtrong, though it is very natural for a man who feels ſtrongly, *on ſuch a ſubject*, to ſpeak ſtrongly.

As to the denial of Diogenes that this writer rendered no ſervices to his country in America, it is a denial in the teeth of fact; unqueſtionably he *did* render very important and eſſential ſervices, not only to his native land in particular, but to the cauſe of religious and moral order in general; and, whatever oppoſition there may be between his preſent ſentiments and our own, we ſhall never ſuffer any prejudice to render us ungrateful or unjuſt; and certainly every real friend to his country muſt acknowledge, with unfeigned gratitude, the ſervices in queſtion, which were performed under very critical and trying circumſtances.

We ſhall purſue this inveſtigation no farther; but, while we admit that Diogenes has certainly exhibited ſome contradictions in his opponent, and quoted ſome paſſages which are open to cenſure, he has completely failed in his attempt to eſtabliſh the moſt ſerious and weighty of all his charges. In the paſſage adduced in ſupport of the charge of *treaſon*, it would puzzle the moſt acute inquirer to diſcover even the ſlighteſt indication of a treaſonable ſentiment. In concluſion, we cannot but expreſs our ſurprize that, in quoting the adage of the Pot and the Kettle, he ſhould not have taken ſpecial care to preclude the poſſibility of its application to himſelf.

A Letter from a Gentleman at Berlin to his Friend in London occaſioned by the Seizure of Sir George Rumbold; containing a ſuccinct View of the Life and Conduct of Macbeth, and a Tranſlation of "Sketches from the Life of Oliver Cromwell," *which have been juſt publiſhed at Berlin by Kotzebue; together with a ſhort Compariſon of the Characters of Macbeth and Cromwell with that of Buonaparté, and a ſummary Application of the Hiſtory of thoſe Regicides to the Events of the preſent Day.* 8vo. Pp. 32. Budd. 1805.

THIS is a very intereſting little tract, exhibiting ſeveral ſtriking analogies between the uſurpers and aſſaſſins of paſt times, and the great uſurper and aſſaſſin, *par excellence*, of the preſent day. It alſo contains many pertinent and judicious obſervations. The concluding remarks addreſſed to princes and ſtateſmen, are particularly forcible, and highly deſerving their moſt ſerious attention.

A Review of the Papers on the War with Spain. By Allan Macleod, Eſq. 8vo. Pp. 96. 2s. 6d. Ginger. 1805.

MR. MACLEOD here enters, with the ſpirit of a Briton, into a manly and

and able juſtification of our government, in reſenting the aggreſſive conduct of the court of Madrid; and demonſtrates the conſequent war with Spain to be both juſt and neceſſary. He truly conſiders the Spaniſh monarch in the degraded light of a tributary, or rather, vaſſal, of France; and his dominions as a province of the new Gallic empire. Throughout the diſcuſſion he preſerves the ſame temper and ſpirit, and his production is equally creditable to his feelings as a man, and to his principles as a patriot.

An Appeal from the Paſſions to the Senſe of the Country upon Buonaparte's Invaſion. 8vo. Pp. 18. Stockdale. 1803.

THIS ſenſible little tract, which has ſo long eſcaped our notice, contains much uſeful advice as to the means of defending our iſland againſt the threatened invaſion of the Corſican ruffian. The author, who diſplays in all his ſentiments and language, the true ſpirit of a Briton, pays ſome juſt compliments to Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville; but ſeems to think that the patriotic ardour of the former of theſe ſtateſmen, had led him in his eager wiſh to cruſh our enemies upon our own ſhores, to pay too little attention to the neceſſary means to prevent them from ſetting foot on the Britiſh ſoil. He will ſee, however, with pleaſure, that the meaſure which he ſo ſtrongly recommends, of increaſing our diſpoſeable force, has been adopted by Mr. Pitt, ſince he became miniſter. And certain it is, that nothing can be more dangerous than to revive at this period the antiquated prejudice, which it has been too much the faſhion to encourage, againſt a ſtanding army. For, in the new ſtate of things which has ariſen in Europe, without a formidable army of this deſcription, we ſhall run great riſk of loſing not merely our liberty, but our independence.

The ſtyle of this pamphlet is entitled to as much praiſe as its matter; and both combine to reflect honour on the head and heart of its author.

POETRY.

The Horrors of Seduction, with other Poems. 12mo. Pr. 142. 6s. Longman and Co. 1805.

WE have peruſed theſe Poems with a mixed ſenſation of pleaſure and concern; of pleaſure excited by the uniformly good ſentiments which pervade them; by the love of religion, morals, and virtue, which is diſplayed in almoſt every page; of concern occaſioned by the want, which the author deplores in his preface, of a literary friend, whoſe advice might have been highly uſeful to him in the correction of errors, and in the ſuggeſtion of improvements. The firſt poem, entitled *The Horrors of Seduction*, is the longeſt of the whole, (indeed the others are all ſonnets or ſhort ballads,) yet not ſufficiently long to embrace all the topics which naturally and neceſſarily ariſe out of the ſubject; than which not one can be found better adapted for the diſplay of poetical genius and ſkill. The ſeducer is, indeed, traced through his vicious career to his death-bed; but we loſe ſight of the object ſeduced at the moment when we feel moſt intereſted about her fate. The author has manifeſted ſome taſte in the ſelection of his imagery, and has ſhewn himſelf not deſtitute of genius, but he wants judgment, not merely to prune luxuriant expreſſions, but to amplify where the

the ſubject requires amplification. His language too is not always correct, and in ſome places, grammar is ſacrificed to rhyme. Ex. Gr.

"While playful Love, with look and mien benign,
Around the nymph his ſlender nets entwine. (entwines

"Lo! her tearful eyes,
Her home, the ſane of happineſs, ariſe. (ariſes)

"He warmly pleads her ſtay, with piteous whine
And mournful look, where dumb affection ſhine. (ſhines)

In P. 64, v.69, *drenched* is uſed inſtead of *drain*, by which the ſenſe of the line is not only totally altered, but the poet is made to ſay the very reverſe of what he means. We had alſo noted ſeveral defective verſes; but we ſhall purſue no farther the painful taſk of pointing out defects in compoſition, where the intention of the writer is ſo manifeſtly good, and his ſentiments and principles are ſo uniformly excellent. The ſmaller pieces in this volume, which occupy one half of it, are much more correct than the larger poem.

A Verſion of the Pſalms of David, attempted in metre. By Joſeph Cottle. 12mo. Pp. 300. Longman and Co. 1805.

Mr. COTTLE's *firſt* verſion of the Pſalms was noticed in the 12th volume of our Review, p. 299; and it is with great pleaſure we perceive, that the preſent is, in all reſpects, an *improved* verſion, and free from thoſe defects which were viſible in the former. From the correct and ingenious obſervations in his preface, it is evident that he entertains very juſt conceptions of the ſerious and moſt difficult taſk which he has undertaken to perform. Speaking of Dr. Watts's production, he truly remarks; "His mind was moſt amply impregnated with genius and piety. Without piety, genius may pleaſe the imagination, but will never affect the heart; and without genius, piety will pleaſe thoſe only who conſider the language and mode in which thoughts are conveyed as of little conſequence. Dr. Watts, however, poſſeſſed a genius which conferred dignity on piety, and a piety which ennobled genius." It is but juſtice to add, that both theſe requiſites, without which no man ſhould attempt to write ſacred poetry, are poſſeſſed, in an eminent degree, by Mr. Cottle.

Of the nature of the *verſion* before us, the only verſion properly ſo called, produced by Mr. C. (for his former production was not, in fact, a verſion of the Pſalms) a juſt idea may be formed from the author's account of his own plan.

"Paralleliſms, thoſe remarkable features in Hebrew poetry, ſo peculiarly pointed out by Bishop Lowth, I have cautiouſly endeavoured to preſerve; whilſt, on ſome few occaſions, I have taken the liberty to ſubjoin to the Pſalm a profeſſed paraphraſe, and on others, to enlarge on a verſe which expreſſed a ſtriking and important ſentiment. This is ſomewhat deviating from what might be expected in a regular verſion, yet is, perhaps, the more entitled to toleration, as it is adding *to*, rather than ſubtracting *from*, the Pſalms, and which, if diſpleaſing to the reader, may generally be paſſed over without injury to the ſenſe. I have, however, on theſe occaſions, guarded againſt the introduction of any ideas which might not fairly be inferred from the text. Theſe brief enlargements,

or

or paraphraſes, will readily be diſtinguiſhed, by a reference to the figures in the margin, which are made to correſpond with the verſes in the Pſalms.

That the author ſhould have failed, in ſeveral inſtances, in imparting to his imitation the force and dignity of the original, is leſs to be wondered at, than that he ſhould have ſucceeded, in ſo many, when the difficulty of the taſk, ariſing from the extreme grandeur and ſublimity of the inſpired pſalmiſt, is properly conſidered.

The Bettyad, a Poem: deſcriptive of the Progreſs of the Young Roſcius in London. By G. M. Woodward, Author of Excentric Excurſions through England and Wales. With a Caricature Plate. 2s. 6d. 4to. Pp. 19. Allen. 1805.

TO enable our readers to form an opinion reſpecting the merits of this poem, which may be conſidered as a hiſtory of the firſt night's perfo:mance of that *wonderful* boy, Maſter William Henry Weſt Betty; we think it ſufficient to quote the following paſſage.

" Next day, the Sunday prints ſo grave,
All other ſubjects careful wave,
From critics laſh to free him;
Recorder!—Meſſenger!—Review!—
All give young Betty honour's due:—
Th' OBSERVER *did not ſee him!*

" Then comes the Chronicle, and Poſt;
The Herald, Times, and all the hoſt,
Prepare their inquiſition:
Then critic ink begins to flow;
And Printer's Devils, in a row,
Are put in requiſition!

" Still incenſe all to Betty raiſe,
E'en wand'ring Syrens chaunt his praiſe,
And hail the wond'rous creature:
In ev'ry corner portraits ſtrike,
And ſtrange to ſay, not two alike,
Yet all pourtray'd from Nature!"

DIVINITY.

A Diſcourſe on the Inſpiration of the Scriptures. By the Rev. Richard King, M. A. Rector of Worthin, Salop; and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. 8vo. Pp. 32. Hatchard. 1805.

A VERY able diſcourſe, exhibiting a brief ſummary of the principal arguments in proof of the inſpiration of the Scriptures. It is a clear, perſpicuous, and forcible exhibition, well-calculated to impreſs the minds of thoſe who have paid but little attention to this important ſubject.

The Case of Hezekiah, considered as a Ground of Consolation, and a Motive to Union in Prayer, at the present alarming State of the King's Health, and of the British Empire: In a Sermon preached at Woburn Chapel, on Sunday, February 26, 1804. By the Rev. G. A. Thomas, L. L. D. Minister of the said Chapel, Prebendary of Lichfield, and Rector of Wickham, Hants. 8vo. Pp. 24. 1s. Rivington's. 1804.

THIS very worthy and respectable clergyman has, since the publication of this discourse, paid the debt of Nature, which all human beings must pay; snatched, in the prime of life, from his family and friends, by whom his loss is most deeply, and most justly, deplored. This sermon, therefore, may be considered as his last legacy, to his Sovereign and his Country. It was preached, at a period of great national alarm, when his Majesty was afflicted with a dreadful illness, when his ministers were on the point of resignation, his councils at a stand, and his kingdom threatened with destruction by an implacable foe. The efficacy of prayer for averting such a dreadful calamity, as that with which this country was then menaced, is shewn from the example of Hezekiah, when labouring under a mortal disease, and rescued from death by the interposing hand of the Almighty. The striking analogy between the characters of the two princes is placed in a strong point of view, and very properly urged as a ground of hope, that the *end* of their affliction would be the same.

From the virtues of the King the preacher naturally passes to the duty of allegiance, on which he makes the following just remarks.

" Far from desiring to make a religious discourse the vehicle of politics, I cannot help observing, that experience, recent and melancholy experience, must have convinced every unprejudiced mind, that any legitimate and lawfully-constituted government is preferable to anarchy, which generally gives birth to the most arbitrary usurpation of dominion, in self appointed governors, and the most abject submission and degradation of the deluded people. In these points (more truly practical than speculative) a single text of Scripture, fairly interpreted with the context, carries with it more conviction, than volumes of metaphysical reveries. 'Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation." (Rom. xiii. 12.) The fair interpretation of which text, I think, is this: they who resist governors ruling conformably to the existing laws, resist the authority of God; and they who thus oppose his wise and beneficial appointment, for the public welfare, shall receive condemnation, not only from the ruling power, whom they resist, but also from the Supreme Governor, whose ordinance they so impiously violate. For the rectitude of this interpretation, I may appeal to those stubborn witnesses, HISTORY and EXPERIENCE.

Certainly this is not too *rigid* an interpretation of the text.—In support of his own opinion, Dr. Thomas gives the following apposite passage from Lord Bacon.

" Allegiance is of greater extent and dimension than laws, or kingdoms, and cannot exist by the laws merely; because it began before laws, it continueth after laws, and it is in vigour when laws are suspended, and have not their force—on politics.

The

The Character and final Perſeverance of the Righteous. A Sermon preached at St. Margaret's Chapel, Weſtminſter, on Sunday December 16, 1804. *On Occaſion of the Death of Mrs. Henrietta Stemler; who departed this Life December* 6, 1804; *aged fifty-five Years: With ſome intereſting Particulars of her Life and Death.* By John Davies, M. A. Miniſter of St. Margaret's Chapel; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. Pp. 40. Hatchard. 1805.

THE lady whoſe merits form the ſubject of this ſermon, was an inſtructreſs of youth, in the city of Weſtminſter. In early life ſhe appears to have been a follower of John Weſley, from whoſe doctrines her mind received a tincture of melancholy and miſtruſt that rendered her, at times, uncomfortable to the end of her days. At leaſt, ſo we underſtand the preacher to mean. He tells us too, that he is not able to inform us; "nor," adds he "do I think ſhe herſelf knew from what preciſe period of her life *her religious experience* is to be dated." We always thought that this ſaid *experience* formed ſo remarkable an epoch in the life of a Methodiſt, and was attended with ſuch extraordinary circumſtances, as to make the moſt powerful, and even indelible, impreſſion on the mind. But, be this as it may, the laſt days of Mrs. Stemler, of which a narrative is here given, prove her to have been a ſincere and pious Chriſtian, who built her faith and her hopes on the only ſolid foundation of all faith and of all hopes.

A Sermon, preached at the Pariſh Church of Trinity, in the Minories, on Wedneſday, October the 19*th*, 1803. *Being the Day appointed for a public Faſt.* By Henry Fly, D. D. F. R. S. and S. A. Miniſter of the ſaid Pariſh.

THIS Faſt-ſermon muſt be claſſed among the beſt of that deſcription of diſcourſes, which, to the honour of our clergy be it ſaid, have been more numerous and able, than on any former occaſion of a ſimilar nature. Dr. Fly deduces from the hiſtory of Hezekiah and the fate of Sennacherib grounds of conſolation and rules of conduct for the people of this country, which is now threatened, and by much the ſame kind of foe, with the ſame fate with which Judah was menaced in thoſe days. By the Lord was Judah delivered, and without the Lord Great Britain cannot be ſaved. The precept is plain as it is forcible, and the inference infallible. If *our* Jeruſalem fall, it will not be the fault of Hezekiah, but of his people. The ſtyle and argument of this ſermon are ſuch as might be expected from an elegant ſcholar and a ſound divine.

An Addreſs from a Country Miniſter to his Pariſhioners, on the Subject of the Cow-Pox, or Vaccine Inoculation. By Thomas Alſton Warren, B. D. Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and Curate of Flamſtead, and Kenſworth, Herts. 12mo. Pp. 22. 4d. or 25 for 6s. Rivingtons. 1803.

THE inhabitants of theſe pariſhes, with the cure of whoſe ſouls Mr. Warren is entruſted, having imbibed ſome ſtrong prejudices againſt inoculation for the cow-pock, compoſed this addreſs for the laudable purpoſe of removing them. And it is very well calculated to produce the deſired effect.

Three plain Reasons for the Practice of Infant Baptism. By Edward Pearson, B.D Rector of Rempstone, Nottinghamshire. 12mo. Pp. 38. 6d. Ingram, Nottingham. Hatchard, London.

WE are happy to find that this zealous and sensible member of the established Church pursues the excellent plan of publishing small tracts, on important points connected with the duties of Christianity, for the information and instruction not only of his own parishioners, but of the public at large. It is a plan, most laudable in itself, and most beneficial in its consequences; and, from the manner in which Mr. Pearson has hitherto conducted it, it must be highly conducive to the removal of errors, and to the establishment of Christian faith. The first of these tracts was noticed in our last, in terms of commendation, inadequate to its merit. The second, now before us, is entitled to an equal portion of praise. The three plain reasons here assigned for the practice of infant baptism are, 1. Because infant-baptism among Christians is correspondent to infant-circumcision among the Jews. 2. Because it is highly probable, that infant-baptism has been practised by the generality of Christians ever since the days of the Apostles. 3. Because, *supposing* the practice of infant-baptism to be an error, it is an error on the safer side. These reasons are ably supported by arguments, derived from Scripture, which cannot, we think, be resisted by any man who sits down to read them, with a mind open to conviction, whatever his previous opinions may be.

In support of one branch of his argument, Mr. Pearson quotes a passage from St. Cyprian, which he very properly recommends, on another account, to the attention of Calvinists.

"The Holy Ghost," says St. Cyprian, "is given to all in equal measures, through the divine indulgence and benignity, without any regard to their bulk or growth. For, as God accepteth no man's person, so neither doth he respect the *age* of any one; since he approves himself the Father of all, and opens to all alike the attainment of his heavenly grace." *Epist.* 64. On which Mr. P. observes, in a note; "This passage of St. Cyprian is equally strong against the opposers of infant-baptism, and against the espousers of the Calvinistic doctrine of *election and reprobation*; and let it be remembered, that this passage was written so early as the year 253."—We leave this pill for Messrs. Overton and Co. to swallow and digest.

A Sermon to Farmers. By the Rev. John Riland, M.A. Rector of Sutton-Coldfield, Warwickshire. Jones, Birmingham. Richardsons, Royal Exchange.

THIS veteran in what is called the *Evangelical School*, has been long known to possess the bathos above most of his fellows of the same persuasion. When Tom Payne had raised a ferment about the Rights of Man, this divine published a threepenny pamphlet upon the Rights of God; and the dull insipidity of the performance corresponded with the degrading absurdity of the title. To the sermon before us is prefixed a grateful dedication to an old farmer, for having assisted the author, with some others, in the delicate and arduous business of compounding for tythes.

" By this benevolent ſcheme" (ſays he) " I am pleaſingly compelled, indulging *to* gratitude, to ſubſcribe myſelf your *affectionate and indebted John Riland.*"

To conciliate attention, he tells his friends the farmers, that they are reputed the leaſt religious, and he is afraid that the accuſation is quite true. He adviſes them to ſay, " God ſpeed the plough; obſerves that the weather is uncertain, that all the elements are at the beck of the God of ſeaſons;" and expatiates upon this idea in a ſtring of *truiſms*. He reminds them that they have homework, when they have no outwork; and this homework is the care of their ſouls.

They are not to ſell too dear. Live and let live. They muſt ſell to the poor in *batches*. If they ſell dear, the ſellers may laugh, but the buyers will weep. He requeſts them not to labour on a Sunday, and then concludes with the neceſſity of caring moſt of all for the ſoul. " You read," ſays he, " of one fool in Luke xii. do not make more! Liſten to me then with both your ears (one would ſuppoſe the whole body had rather more than two ears amongſt them all) whilſt I with warm earneſtneſs, &c." At laſt he has the modeſty to let Mr. Hervey ſpeak for him, and wretched indeed muſt be that orator, who does not ſpeak better for him than he can ſpeak for himſelf. Such is his wide extended fame in the midland counties, that many in the courſe of his long labours have been induced to hear and ſee him in the pulpit on account of his oddity; and the uniform report has been, that he is a *driv'ler, and a ſhew*. Of his pen we may wiſh with the poet,

Jupiter, ut pereat poſitum rubigine telum!

The Influence of Chriſtianity on the Military and Moral Character of a Soldier. A Sermon, preached before a Detachment of the Second Weſt York Militia, at Whitburn, in the County of Durham, on Sunday, November, 25, 1804. By the Rev. J. Symons, B. D. Rector. 8vo. Pp. 43. Rivingtons. 1805.

" AND the ſoldiers likewiſe demanded of him, ſaying, and what ſhall we do? And he ſaid unto them, do violence to no man, neither accuſe any falſely, and be content with your wages."—*Luke* iii. 14. A text more appropriate to the ſubject than this, perhaps, could not well be ſelected.

We have peruſed this ſermon with great ſatisfaction. It is a diſpaſſionate, perſpicuous diſcourſe, extremely well adapted to the habits and underſtandings of ſuch a congregation as that to which it was delivered. The reverend author ſucceſsfully combats the opinion, that war is unlawful; and enlarges with much effect on the advantages which are to be derived by a ſoldier, as well in his public, as in his private character, from a due attention to the doctrines of Chriſtianity. We can confidently recommend the ſermon to the attention of ſuch military officers as may feel intereſted in the morals and diſcipline of their *corps*.

MISCELLANIES.

Second Report of the Committee for managing the patriotic Fund, eſtabliſhed at Lloyd's Coffee-houſe, 20th July, 1803. 8vo. Pp. 188.

IT is impoſſible for any one, having the feelings of a Briton, to read this truly patriotic volume without a w of ſatisfaction, and a ſtimulus

mulus of honeſt pride. It contains a memorable example of the liberality of the age, and many glorious inſtances of Britiſh valour ſucceſsfully exerted againſt the enemies of the country. The following is a ſummary of the receipts and expenditure of this admirable fund.

"The total amount of the ſubſcriptions is 158,343l. 5s. 10d. and £1,200l. three per cent. conſols. The amount of the dividends received on government ſecurities is 13,004l. The amount paid and voted is 19,434l. 1s. 6d.; excluſive of 407l per annum granted for the lives of the reſpective parties, and eſtimated at about 6000l."

We are happy to find that the contributions to this fund have been ſo ample, as to be greatly more than adequate to meet all the calls upon it, and as to render it unneceſſary to tax the generoſity of the public any farther, at preſent.

A Narrative, expoſing a Variety of Facts and irregular Tranſactions in one of the Departments of Foreign Corps, during the late War. By James Poole, ſeveral Years a regimental Inſpector, and ſince Deputy Inſpector-General in that Department. 8vo. 3s. Parſons. 1804.

An Anſwer to a Pamphlet of Mr. James Poole, entitled, A Narrative, &c. &c. By Mr. Gardiner. 8vo. 3s. Evans. 1804.

A Reply to Mr. Richard Gardiner's Anſwer to a Narrative, expoſing irregular Tranſactions, &c. &c. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Egerton. 1805.

THE tranſactions to which theſe pamphlets refer are of much too ſerious a nature to be decided, or even diſcuſſed, in a court of criticiſm. To the commander in chief and to the ſecretary at war, as the proper judges in ſuch a cauſe, we conſign them, with an aſſurance that they will be found highly deſerving their moſt ſerious attention.

A Letter addreſſed to the Right Honourable Lord Hobart, his Majeſty's late principal Secretary of State for the Colonial Department. By Colonel Thomas Picton, late Governor and Captain-General of the Iſland of Trinidad, and Brigadier-General commanding the Troops on that Iſland. 8vo. 2s. Lloyd.

A Refutation of the Pamphlet which Colonel Picton lately addreſſed to Lord Hobart. By Col. Fullarton, F. R. S. 4to. 2s. 6d. Stockdale.

WHO can decide when colonels, and commiſſioners, diſagree?—Certainly not critics. Beſides, adhuc ſub judice lis eſt. The Privy Council has taken cognizance of the unhappy diſputes between theſe gentlemen, and it would be indecorous in us to give an opinion on the ſubject, previous to its deciſion. We can only lament, therefore, the exiſtence of the difference, and the perſonal aſperity to which it has given riſe.

Obſervations on the Weſt India Dock Salaries, in a Letter addreſſed to Randle Jackſon, Eſq. Barriſter at Law. 8vo. Pp. 16. Stockdale.

THE object of this writer is to expoſe the directors of the Weſt India docks for the acceptance of ſtipends or ſalaries, for the diſcharge of their duty. Conſidering that theſe ſituations are moſtly filled by merchants, and men of opulence, we confeſs it appears to us that there are good

grounds for his cenſures. The majority of proprietors, however, it ſeems, entertained a different opinion, by voting ſuch ſalaries.

An Eſſay of [*on*] *the Impolicy of a Bounty on the Exportation of Grain; and of the Principles which ought to regulate the Commerce of Grain, divided under the following Heads: Of the Hiſtory of the Corn Laws; Influence of the Population on the Corn-Trade; Effects of the Bounty on the Rent of Lands; Effects of the Bounty on the Profits of the Farmer; Effects of the Bounty on the Value of Silver; Exportation and Importation; Landlords, Farmers, and Corn-Dealers.* 8vo. Pr. 70. 2s. 6d. Baldwins, London. Anderſon, Edinburgh. 1804.

THE author has here opened to himſelf a wide field of diſcuſſion; but he does not range at large in it, without method or without a guide; but purſues, with ſteady ſtep, a ſtraight path, clearing before him the thorns and thiſtles which obſtruct his courſe. There is ſcarcely a ſubject of more difficulty, or one on which a greater variety of opinions obtains, than the corn-trade; and the public are certainly much indebted to any intelligent man who, having directed his attention to it, communicates the reſult of his obſervations and inquiries. Such a man is the writer of this tract, who condemns the bill for granting a bounty on the exportation of grain, and indeed all meaſures, either of a reſtrictive nature, or otherwiſe, which have for their object an interference with, or regulation of, the corn trade. It is a matter of vaſt importance, and preſents conſiderable difficulties, in whatever point of view it is conſidered. The advocates, however, for either ſyſtem, for a free and for a reſtricted trade, may derive much advantage and information, from the peruſal of this eſſay, in which the ſubject is diſcuſſed with ability and temper.

The Spectator in Miniature: being a Collection of the principal Religious, Moral, Humourous, Satyrical, and Critical Eſſays, contained in that celebrated Publication. Compreſſed into Two Volumes. By the Rev. F. Prevoſt, and F. W. Blagdon, Eſq. 24mo. Pr. 700. 2s. 6d. Suttaby. 1804.

THESE ingenious and induſtrious literary *provveditori*, who ſupply wholeſome food for every mind, have ſelected ſuch eſſays, from the Spectator, as relate to ſubjects of permanent intereſt; omitting only ſuch of the papers as were limited to objects of a temporary nature. The lives of Addiſon and Steele, with their portraits, are prefixed, one to each volume. In an appropriate preface the editors expreſs a wiſh, in which every friend to virtue will join them, "that ſome eloquent eſſayiſt, ſome modern *Spectator* may riſe, to ridicule the contemptible follies of the day, to check the growing profligacy of manners, and to ſtop the alarming progreſs of zealous fanaticiſm: and that, inſtead of contradictory, abſurd, and idle reports of news-writers, the *daily* preſs, by preſenting ſhort and moral eſſays, may again be turned into a vehicle of wiſdom and virtue; and applied to make men good and wiſe, rather than prejudiced and talkative politicians."

Theſe gentlemen proclaim their intention, in caſe this their firſt eſſay ſhould meet with adequate ſupport, to follow it up with abridged editions, on a ſimilar plan, of other celebrated periodical publications. And when we conſider the quantity of matter (for the type is very ſmall) and the lowneſs *of the price*, we think it can ſcarcely fail of ſucceſs.

Goliah's

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Goliath's serio-comic Appeal from the British Critic to the Anti-Jacobins, in which are contained some Strictures upon the Principles and Conduct of the People called Quakers.

TO THE MOST LEARNED, THE MOST LOYAL, AND MOST ORTHODOX, MY LORDS * ANTI-JACOBINS, IN THEIR HIGH COURT OF CRITICISM MOST ILLUSTRIOUSLY ASSEMBLED,

This ſerio-comic appeal is humbly preſented, and ſubmitted to their candid conſideration, the author nothing doubting that their Lordſhips final decree will be to the glory of the appellant, and the confuſion and *trembling* of all the enemies of Goliath ſlain.

——— Ridentem dicere verum
Quid vetat! HOR.
Men' moveat Cimex Pantilius? HOR.
Qui tremulum non odit, amet tua Critica Brito. VIRG.

MY LORDS,

PERMIT me to treſpaſs a few moments upon your time, while I call your attention to a humble literary performance, in the ſhape of a faſt-day ſermon. The title of this diſcourſe, my Lords, is *Goliath ſlain*, and *the Philiſtines put to flight:* a loyal and patriotic title, my Lords, and of good omen, which we all hope and truſt, will one day be fulfilled. My Lords, I preſume, a copy of this diſcourſe, in homely rural typography, was preſented to your right honourable bench, according to the particular inſtructions of the author; but probably its outward appearance (which I own was rather ſuſpicious) might ſtrike you with the idea that it came from ſome ſchiſm ſhop, which, I knew, would be no recommendation to your Lordſhips; and ſo it might be thrown aſide, among the other neglected lumber of your court, of the laſt year. Such as it is, my Lords, I hereby acknowledge it as one of the few literary ſins which I have to anſwer for. I had flattered myſelf that it was but a peccadillo; but Mr. Britiſh Critic, of November laſt, tells me it is the greateſt offence that ever was committed in "any Engliſh pulpit," and "adviſes me, on many accounts," (without naming *any*,) never to commit the like again, at leaſt in the article of "printing." In the plenitude of his epiſcopal authority, he forbears to ſilence me in the pulpit. The preaching part, it ſeems, if "I will inſiſt upon preaching," is ſtill left at my own option, for which I am very thankful, and ſhall not fail to govern myſelf according to the indulgence granted me, as often as I am in the humour for it. So far all is well: but pray, my Lords, what right had Mr. Britiſh to lay me under any reſtraint as to "printing?" Who gave him the authority of non-imprimatur? And what buſineſs had he to intrude his Brito Critical advice upon me unaſked? My Lords, ſaving your preſence, this was a piece of very great impertinence, for which I muſt take leave to *criticiſe* a little with Mr. *Britiſh*; and not only ſo, but to *condole*

* The Anti-Jacobins being judges *en dernier reſort*, (for who ſhall review the Reviewing Reviewers?) have a right to be addreſſed as peers of the realm of—CRITICISM.

with him; for ſince he hath thought fit to be the wanton and unprovoked aggreſſor, I muſt let him ſee that I can be "ſorry" as well as he. Yes, my Lords, I am "ſorry," very "ſorry," that any critic profeſſing himſelf *Britiſh*, ſhould be ſo "deficient in judgment," as to cavil at a diſcourſe which was very well received by a genteel congregation, which was very handſomely ſpoken of by ſeveral very ſenſible and intelligent *reviewers in private life*, and which hath been honoured with the *public teſtimony** of better judges than himſelf. This Britiſh critic, my Lords, is no more qualified to *criticiſe* a faſt-day ſermon, than I am to teach a Rigadoon. He is a fellow, my Lords, of no critical "mark or likelihood;" neither analyſis nor ſyntheſis in him. *He is not upt to a quotation*, neither beginning, middle, nor end, in his brain, conſequently an *infinite* blockhead. In ſhort, my Lords, this Britiſh critic was formed for nothing but d———n.†

But hold, if I go on at this rate, I may ſubject myſelf to an action of damages for breaking up the Britiſh *ferme*, and ſending all their cuſtomers to your Lordſhips court. I ſhould be ſorry that this poor wretch of a ſcribbler ſhould ſtarve for want of bread. He might not find ſo ready a market for any more of his *bad* criticiſms, and I ſhrewdly ſuſpect that he has no talent for writing any thing that is *good*.

My Lords, I had been given to underſtand that this Britiſh court was a court of loyalty and orthodoxy, holding a ſort of concurrent juriſdiction with that of your Lordſhips; but from ſome late ſymptoms I am inclined to ſuſpect that there is ſomething "rotten in the ſtate of Denmark." Probably they may not have a ſufficient *fund* of orthodoxy to carry on buſineſs, and ſo theſe Britiſh critics are reduced to the neceſſity of occaſionally admitting a heterodox quarter-partner to keep their heads above water, and to ſave the *ferme* from—What ſhall I ſay? God forbid that this ſhould ever be the caſe with your Lordſhips.

My Lords, I am very ſenſible that this ſermon of mine is very far from a *chef d'œuvre*; but whatever its demerits may be, I could not help expoſing them. As to the preaching part, my Lords, I had a *call*. Do not frown, my Lords, I repeat the word, I had a *call*, that is to ſay, by the *poſt*. And I may venture to add, that I had alſo a *call* to "print;" not by the *poſt*, my Lords, but from the *inward motion of the ſpirit*. I ſee, by your whiſpering, my Lords, that you do not like me the better for this *inward motion of the ſpirit*. You ſeem to regard me as one of thoſe *evangelical preachers*, whoſe ſermons, I know, are not to your taſte. But if you will be pleaſed to exerciſe a little judicial patience, I will explain myſelf. It was an *inward call* of the *Quaker-ſpirit*, my Lords. What! (your Lordſhips ſeem to ſay) a Quaker moved by the ſpirit to print a *faſt-day ſermon* preached in the *ſteeple-houſe!* Pardon me, my Lords, you miſconceive me; I meant only to ſay, that I had a *call* of my *own ſpirit*, or my own *ſelf-will*, which I take to be the true *Quaker ſpirit*. Yes, my Lords, I confeſs I felt this ſpirit ſtirring within me, and urging me to "print" in vindication of my character, from the aſperſions of gainſayers and blaſphemers of every denomination; and more particularly of a queer ſet of people among us, in whoſe outward deportment there is *much ſleekneſs*, but in whoſe inward parts there is ſaid to *little truth*. By what ſtrange policy, my Lords, was it enacted that a ſet of

* Vide Orthodox Churchman's Review for February 1804.

† In the theatrical ſenſe. Theologically ſpeaking, μη γενοιτο.

men notorious, and even proverbial for *inattention to facts*, ſhould enjoy the excluſive privilege of credit upon their *bare words?* You know, my Lords, there were no members from *Ireland* in either houſe to make any ſuch motion. But let that paſs; the thing is done; and the wiſdom of parliament muſt not be called in queſtion.

If ever you have met with any of theſe people in your travels, my Lords, the following portrait may help to call them to your remembrance:

In bodily conformation they are ſuppoſed to be like other men, only with this difference, that their necks and knees are without joints, and their backbones, *sans vertebræ*, ſo that they can neither kneel, nor bow, nor bend the body. In the way of ſalutation, they "kingly do but nod." They are not much addicted to ſports of any kind, ſave that of cudgel-playing with *Priſcian* *, whoſe head they break moſt unmerciſully every day, and every hour of the day. They are diſtinguiſhed by coats of antique cut; and they wear umbrellas of a conſiderable ſize, paſted and glued to their heads.

They are very proud of their own *caſt*, and have no connection with any other in the way of natural union, ſome few inſtances of wanton apoſtacy excepted; in all which caſes the offending parties are ſeverely puniſhed, even with expulſion and loſs of their *caſt*.

What religion theſe people are of, it is difficult to ſay. It hath been aſſerted that they are Jeſuits; and, indeed, in ſeveral points, they bear a ſtriking reſemblance to the diſciples of *Loyola's* ſchool; ſuch as diſſimulation, equivocation, mental reſervation, and hoſtility to the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment of theſe realms; and, laſtly, in their ready adoption of the Latin maxim *calumniare fortiter, aliquid adhærebit*, which the moſt ignorant among them know how to tranſlate, at leaſt *practically*.

Others have pronounced them no Chriſtians, which may be the caſe; though they pretend to more "perfect" Chriſtianity than any of their neighbours. They ſay they have "no ſin," and conſequently never pray for pardon. They are above *ordinances*, or rather they never had any ordinances. They want no inſtruction from the *hireling ministry* of the *steeple-houſe*, truſting entirely to friend Barclay †, and their own inward lanthiern and guide-poſt. "No gabbling over confeſſions and petitions" is ever heard in their religious aſſemblies, in which all is ſtill as a mouſe. No ſound is hea-d among them but the *horrid ſound* of ſilence, or the ſtill more horrid ſound of the *imo ex pectore hum*; ſave when ſome gifted brother, or doubly-gifted ſiſter, comes out of Macedonia to help them to a little uſe of ſpeech. Upon ſuch occaſions they are all alive, and cards fly round in all directions to invite their neighbours of every denomination to come and partake of the religious entertainment provided for them, and to ſee and hear the glorious fruits of the *unſtinted* ſpirit, and of a free and no-*hireling ministry*, whether in the theatre, or the upper room of an inn, or elſewhere; for theſe people, like the Perſian magi of old, ſeem to attach no particular ſanctity to any one place more than another.

But the principal part of their religious worſhip conſiſts in *ſilent reveries*, in which they are caught up the Lord knows where, and are ſo bewildered in the immenſity of ſpiritual ſpace, that they can find no ſubſtantial or cer-

* Breaking Priſcian's head is a proverbial expreſſion for ſpeaking falſe grammar.—N. B. This note was not intended for Anti-Jacobin information.

† Vide Barclay paſſim.

tain object for their faith to reſt upon. Some of our moſt eminent divines have pronounced their religion pure deiſm; but if theſe learned men will be pleaſed to re-conſider the ſubject, I think they will ſee ſome cauſe to accede to my definition, viz. that it is *pure nonsense*.

Some good qualities they are obſerved to ſet out with, which, however, do not improve under their management; for they have the unhappy talent of converting that which is good in them into evil. Their punctilious abſtinence from profane ſwearing in common converſation is highly commendable; but not ſufficient to compenſate for their pertinaciouſly refuſing to ſwear in *judgment*, *juſtice*, and *truth*, and ſo ſuffering criminals to eſcape condign puniſhment *, by which very ſerious injury may be done to the community. And ſtill more exceptionable are their wild, viſionary, and impracticable notions of Chriſtian peace, which, in times of inevitable war and public danger, render them the dead weight of the community; or rather the *torpedos* of all that come in contact with them, and the *remoras* of the veſſel in which all good ſubjects, with all that is dear to them, are embarked.

Upon this unpardonable conduct of theirs, I took the liberty to expoſtulate with them pretty roundly, telling them, not in the very words, (leſt they ſhould "ſmile and grin," (as Mr. Britiſh Critic ſays,) but in words to the following effect: viz. That in caſe all hands ſhould be wanting upon deck, they muſt not expect to be eternally indulged in their idle dreams and nonſenſical ſcruples, lolling in their hammocks, and crying peace, peace. No, no, ſaid I, every thing in its ſeaſon. Peace is a fine thing, no doubt, but we cannot come at it in a tempeſt. When the ſtate veſſel is in danger of being overſet, it is no time to cry peace, peace, but—all hands upon deck; oh! ohe!—thee friend Arm-ſtrong take a rope—thee friend Strong-back take a ſpell at the pump—thee friend Nimble-toe run up aloft, and haul down the top-gallants and main-ſail—thee friend Steady ſtand to the helm, and beware of *back-sliding*. In ſhort, all of ye ſtand to your tackle, and prove yourſelves true Britiſh hearts of oak, and ſturdy Anti-Gallicans. None of your *ſhivering ague-fits* now, I beſeech you.

In the mean time I called upon them to lug out a fair quota of their mammon of unrighteouſneſs, telling them that it was out of all reaſon that we *steeple-house* men ſhould bear the whole burthen like aſſes, while they, ſly foxes, were "ſmiling and grinning" in their ſleeves at our ſimplicity for ſuffering ourſelves to be made the dupes of their hypocriſy and cunning. And, in the warmth of my *declamation* †, I challenged the whole flock of *Meroz*, with their bell-weather at their head, to juſtify ſuch niggardly, ſuch unmanly, ſuch unpatriotic conduct; and I offered to pluck out thoſe peace-peace maggots which that quibbling young Scotch Jeſuit had planted in their noddles. In vain—as well might you attempt to convert the Jews, as to perſuade theſe incorrigibly pertinacious men to ſhoulder a muſket, or part with a ſhilling in the cauſe of God and their country.

Not that I *altogether* failed of ſucceſs. From two or three of them who had a little more ſhame than the reſt, I extorted upwards of a hundred pounds to purchaſe flannel waiſtcoats for the volunteers; ſo that however Mr. Britiſh Critic may deſpiſe my ſermon, it was not an unprofitable one.

It is true theſe patriotic donations of my few friends were clogged with

---

* A late inſtance of this we have ſeen at G——r in a cauſe of forgery.

† By this hangs a little ſparring tale.

an awkward ſort of proviſo; for the jackets to be bought with this ſanctified money were only to be worn in a peaceable and quaker-like manner, and *medicinally* to prevent colds and Rheumatiſms. This might have ſubjected the poor volunteers to the inconvenience of *ſtripping* in the heat of action, and giving their enemies an advantage in the critical moment. However, willing to run all hazards at ſuch an alarming criſis, I would not have refuſed a hundred or two more, even with this reſtriction; but with all my powers of oratory, which are acknowledged to be uncommonly great, and to leave a *ſtrong ſenſation* behind, *eſpecially on faſt-days*, I could not, for the life of me, ſqueeze a ſhilling more from this pertinacious and parſimonious tribe of men. Yet ſmall as the ſum was, I became very proud of it; becauſe I piqued myſelf upon a *new diſcovery in requiſitionary finance*, at a time when money was ſo much wanted for the public ſervice; a diſcovery which, I hope, will be improveable, and recommend me to the favourable notice of the premier miniſter of theſe realms, and procure me a canonry of Windſor, a preferment for which I have a very ſtrong predilection "on many accounts," (as Mr. Britiſh ſays) and of which I with I may not be diſappointed. But canon or no canon, Mr. Premier ſhall have my moſt fervent prayers, and another faſt-day ſermon, (if that will do him any good) to ſupport him in his arduous combat with this overgrown gigantic champion of Gath, whom I ſlew, October 19, 1803, and whoſe horrendous viſage I exhibited before the congregation of the people; at which Mr. Britiſh Critic ſays, he "thinks" they "ſmiled and grinned." (By the way, my Lords, is not this Britiſh Critic an *Iriſh* critic, with a *cork-ſcrew* in his *thinking* faculty, which *twiſts* his head to the *left* when it ſhould be to the *right?)* Yes, my Lords, I moſt ſincerely wiſh that Mr. Premier may be enabled to make as quick diſpatch with him, as I have to boaſt of. Could he but ſeize ſome critical occaſion to give this horrid monſter the knock-down blow, and leave him extended on the plain, he would do an ineſtimable ſervice to his country, and to all Europe. For ſuch an exploit, however, he muſt expect neither prayers nor thanks from the Quakers; nor any better treatment than I experienced upon a like occaſion. And if ever he ſhould offer himſelf as a candidate for any borough where they have gotten a ſtrong footing, they will vote againſt him, one and all; and not only ſo, but oppoſe him with all their intereſt and influence, and all their powers of *calummiare fortiter*, which are very conſiderable. The ſpirit will move them to cry *war-man! tax-man! teſt-man!* and for a moment ſuſpend its hoſtility to the *ſteeple-houſe*, and hoiſt the flag in triumph over him.*

Theſe are the people, my Lords, of whom I ſtand in jeopardy every hour. Yes I know they hate me with a moſt perfect hatred. And for what, my Lords? Even for telling them, in their own blunt way, that they ought to be aſhamed of themſelves for thus deſerting the cauſe of God and their country. For this plain-ſpoken truth, my Lords, they are become my moſt determined enemies; and, being men of long-winded malice, they will never forgive me. Who knows how many more *anonymous letters* and *Britiſh criticisms* the *ſpirit* of vengeance may furniſh them with in their ſecret and ſilent councils? Would you have thought, my Lords, that men of a ſemblance ſo dove-like, could retain ſo much gall and bitterneſs in their

---

* The Quakers are now as buſtling and handy at theſe things as any other men.

hearts?

hearts? But appearances, my Lords, are deceitful, eſpecially diſtant ones. Approach thoſe *apparent* doves, and the deception will vaniſh. Not an atom more of *innocence* will be found in *them* than in birds of other feather; and of *humility* not near ſo much. They are too proud to pray and aſk pardon for their offences, as hath been already intimated. To own themſelves in the wrong, and to aſk forgiveneſs, would be tantamount to *steeple-house confeſſion*, which the great bell-weather of the flock hath taught them to hold in contempt and deriſion. Thus, however *ſtiff-rumped* theſe people may be, they certainly are not *ſtrait-laced*; and, notwithanding all their ranting againſt *Peter's great steeple-house*, and the great *hireling minister thereof*, I cannot help ſuſpecting that, in this *ſpirit* of theirs, there is a ſpice of ſomething very like popery. They certainly have a *diſpenſation* for ſin, however they came by it. They can lie, cheat, equivocate, break their promiſe, and betray their truſt; they can ſlander, back-bite, and calumniate; they can deal in works of darkneſs, corruption, and *rotteneſs*; and all this without remorſe. In all theſe matters their conſciences give them no pain. But when called upon for a little *ſwearing* and *fighting*, though it were in the cauſe of *public juſtice*, and to ſave a *whole nation from deſtruction and bondage*, they are conſtantly ſeized with *tender ſcruples* and *ſhivering ague-fits*.

But here ſome ſhallow-brained Britiſh Critic will exclaim, fine Chriſtian doctrine truly! Here is a dragoon-chaplain urging the poor harmleſs Quakers to ſwear and fight like troopers. Was ever ſuch language heard from "any Engliſh pulpit." This (we think) could hardly fail of ſetting all his hearers a "ſmiling and grinning." Whatever the man's "intention might be," we are ſorry he ſhould be ſo deficient in judgment, and that he ſhould ſo egregiouſly miſtake the very nature of a faſt-day, and the "intention of government in appointing it *;" which ſurely could not be to beat up for recruits of light dragoons to trample our fellow-creatures under foot of men and horſes, but to widen the church-doors according to *that excellent prayer* †, &c. and to pray for the proſperity of our enemies, whom we are at all times commanded to *love*; and whom we ought now in gratitude to *careſs*, ſeeing they are ſo good and ſo kind as to ſay, they only wait for the firſt opportunity of fair wind and weather to pay us a *domiciliary viſit*, and help us to repeal the teſt; that odious and ugly teſt which ſtill ſtands as a barrier in the way of our advancement, and confines all the loaves and fiſhes in the pale of the *ſteeple-house*.

All this, I know, was *implied* in Mr. Britiſh's *Critique*, though nothing more than "ſmiles and grins," and "deficient in judgment," and "never leſs adapted, &c. were *expreſſed*;" and for not ſpeaking out he had his reaſons. He was afraid to hazard more, leſt the cloven foot of the diſloyal ſecretary ſhould be more prominent than his purpoſe required.

My Lords, I humbly conceive that the intention of government, "in appointing a faſt-day," is not to make *Quakers* of *us*, but to make our enemies, *Quakers*, *i. e.* tremblers; and, under this idea, I did not think it improper, after the devotions of the deſk, to *declaim* a little from "an Engliſh

---

* Anonymous letter ſent me, and ſo much in the ſtyle and ſentiment of the Britiſh criticiſm, that I have a ſtrong ſuſpicion of their both coming from the ſame corner.

† In the anonymous letter my ſermon was contraſted with that *excellent prayer*, &c. viz. in the ſervice for 1803.

pulpit"

pulpit" upon the neceſſity of valorous exertion *on our part*; and I was almoſt tempted to introduce the fable of Hercules and the Waggoner, which the puritanical Mr. Britiſh, no doubt, would have ſaid was very "ill adapted to "an Engliſh pulpit" on a ſolemn faſt-day, it being a heatheniſh fable, and conſequently unfit for Chriſtians to hear; beſides the idea of a huge muſcular demi-god in the cloud ſcolding a lazy-lubbard waggoner for not clapping his ſhoulder to the wheel, might have ſet the whole congregation a "ſmiling and grinning," which certainly is very improper behaviour, and very ill becoming an occaſion ſo ſerious.

My Lords, in this war-whoop *declamation* of mine from "an Engliſh pulpit," I could have no other view than the welfare and ſafety of my country. Private advantage, with regard to me, was out of the queſtion. What was I to gain by battle and bloodſhed more than any other man? My Lords, being but a half-pay chaplain of a diſbanded regiment, I was entirely *hors de combat*. I could have ſhared none of the *rich* booty of a run-away army of beggarly Frenchmen, not ſo much as a maſs-book, my Lords. But why do I ſay a maſs-book? I doubt whether ſuch a curioſity could have been found in the whole army; for you know, my Lords, Frenchmen are now grown too proud to ſay their prayers, and in this reſpect reſemble our *upright* Quakers, as alſo in their rejecting the Church-kalendar, and ſubſtituting another of their own invention; ſo that you ſee, my Lords, there would have been two points of union and attraction between theſe two deſcriptions of people at their very firſt interview, which, by degrees, might have brought them to a more perfect aſſimilation, beginning with the diſcipline of marching, counter-marching, preſenting, and firing, and ending with cutting capers *a-la-mode de Paris*. What ſort of *dancers* the *Friends* might have made, I am not prepared to ſay; but I am inclined to think that they would have been found rather awkward in learning that polite accompliſhment. Buonaparté, himſelf in perſon, could never have brought them to make a good *premiere reverence* *, for a certain natural impediment in the vertebræ, as already mentioned.

My Lords, I hope enough hath been ſaid to convince you that I could have no ſelf-intereſted view in taking upon me the commiſſion of ſerjeant-eccleſiaſtic to drill theſe contumacious religioniſts. My motive, my Lords, was truly public-ſpirited and patriotic. Upon a moderate computation I had reckoned upon the poſſibility of raiſing a corps of twenty thouſand Quakers upon an emergency; none of your Falſtaff's ragged recruits, but with good linen and coats upon their backs, only the ſkirts rather too long. Such a project, my Lords, would have furniſhed a conſiderable augmentation of the military force of theſe realms, at a criſis which ſo imperiouſly demanded our utmoſt exertions.

And, with regard to their religious ſcruples, I told them I *did* maintain, and now tell them again that I *do* maintain, and that to my dying day I *will* maintain, that it is not only *permitted*, but an indiſpenſable duty of every ſoul of us, Quakers and all, to fight, and to fight manfully *pro aris et focis, toties quoties*, let Buonaparté come on us as often as he will.

This duty of ſelf-defence, individually or nationally ſpeaking, I need not tell your Lordſhips, is grounded upon the firſt law of nature, a law never ſuperſeded, nor meant to be ſuperſeded, neither by the laws of *Moſes*, nor

* Very low bow,

the

the law of Chriſtianity, nor any other law but Quaker law. Upon this ground I might challenge the whole corps, one and indiviſible of them. But what avails it to contend with ſuch ſlippery diſputants? In vain may you preſs them with arguments from the Bible. With *them* the Bible is of no further authority than as it is interpreted by the ſpirit of Friend Barclay: and even in Barclay we have no ſure hold of them; for when Friend Robert does not bear them out at every point, each individual ſlinks into the labyrinth of *his own private* ſpirit, where no *steeple-house* man has any clue to follow him. Quo teneam, &c.

My Lords, I preſume you have read the *Snake in the Grass*. The author of that book ſeems to have been a near obſerver, and to have known them well. From him I learn that thoſe ſcruples of conſcience againſt handling fire-arms, any otherwiſe than in the way of mankind, and vending them, are all mere pretence. He declares that they can prime and load, preſent and fire, as well as the beſt of us, if they pleaſe; and he refers us to chapter and verſe in the hiſtory of our country, when they fought like heroes. Nay, I do not know but ſome of them might be of Cromwell's *lobster-corps* of invincibles. So that you ſee, my Lords, there is a deadly *fighting ſpirit* in them, when they give their minds to it. And when once their hands are fairly in, they are not ſatisfied with little matters. We find how lightly they accounted of their favourite leader's little achievements at home, and how eagerly they ſtimulated him to make the grand tour of Europe a-la-Buonaparté. But as to this fighting buſineſs they are rather delicate in their choice. It is not every quarrel that they like. In this affair between George and Napoleon they ſeem to have been wavering, though there was a time when I very much ſuſpected that they were edging towards the latter. God forgive me if I did them any wrong. But now Friend George being pretty well ſupported, he may rely on their allegiance while he can keep poſſeſſion. Yes, my Lords, theſe men are wiſe in their generation, always *ſubmitting* to the powers that be, when they cannot help it, and venting all the bile of their *reſiſtance* againſt the *steeple-house* and a *hireling miniſtry*, of whom they have many woeful tales to tell about the ſpoiling of their goods, and other grievous perſecutions, at the next annual meeting of *Friends*, when their loſſes and damages are all repaired out of the common purſe; and the names of the ſufferers and confeſſors are honourably mentioned in the uncouth ſtile and ridiculous records of this queer ſociety.

In theſe and all other points of wiſdom they are inwardly inſtructed by the *ſpirit*, which is their infallible oracle in all their enterprizes and purſuits, eſpecially in the ways and means of getting money; in order to which they are inſpired to be active, buſtling, and diligent in their callings, and to let no day paſs without ſome addition to their ſtore; and, above all, to redouble their diligence on *faſt-days* *, which are days of *monopoly* to *Friends*, when all the *steeple-house* men have ſhut up their ſhops, and gone to pray for the ſucceſs of his majeſty's fleets and armies, for which wicked and bloody-minded prayers they certainly deſerve to be puniſhed, and for which *Friends* are authorized by the ſpirit to ſteal their cuſtom from them upon all occaſions.

There was a time when this ſpirit of theirs was exceedingly turbulent

---

* Quære, Is the ſame contempt of the royal proclamation obſervable in the metropolis?

and

and unruly, forcing its way into the *steeple-house* to gainſay and contradict the *hireling minister* in the middle of his oration. Sometimes in its freaks it would take a long pole and break the windows of the ungodly from eaſt to weſt, and from weſt to eaſt. But of late years it hath been ſo ſtill and quiet, that by certain ſhrewd obſervers it is ſuſpected of having reſigned its dominion to another ſpirit of a very different character, called the *spirit* of *trade*, only reſerving to itſelf the occaſional right to rant and rail a little againſt the *hireling ministry*, eſpecially on faſt-days, and the annual meetings of *Friends* *.

From theſe people, my Lords, from theſe *quondam* unruly ranters, now metamorphoſed into ſly and miſchievous foxes, I have received injuries which, I fear, can never be repaired. I once thought that Quakers would neither ſwear nor d—mn; but, from ſad experience, I am now convinced of the contrary. Seated on the Britiſh Critic bench, (how their broad brims found admittance there, your Lordſhips ſhall hear by and by,) they have d—mned me and my ſermon to all eternity. Nay, they have not only d—mned the ſermon which I have already preached and printed, but all other ſermons which I may hereafter preach and print. Is not this d——n with a witneſs, my Lords? By which an immenſe *potentiality* of wealth hath been loſt to me; and by which my reputation, as a faſt-day preacher, is blaſted, ruined, and undone. How can I have the effrontery ever to appear again in any "Engliſh pulpit," if any body who has the command of one ſhould be mad enough to afford me another occaſion? And to add to the aggravation, this diſgrace hath befallen me at a time when there is a fair proſpect of removes and vacant dignities, to ſome of which, in the height of my glory, I might have aſpired with meritorious pretenſion, and ſo have retired in *otia tuta*, after all my labours, and lucubrations and faſt-day preachings, and *giant-killings*, amidſt a hoſt of foes, in *the tents* of *Meshech*, and *the dwellings of Kedar*.

But, my Lords, my greateſt woe is yet untold. Something more than a twelve-month ago, my Lords, I had the grievous misfortune to loſe the fineſt and faireſt turkey-cock that ever mortal eye beheld. It had been reared with the moſt tender care, and fed at no little coſt, and was intended as a Chriſtmas preſent for a very worthy friend living and dwelling at R——— in S——— (where may he long happily live and dwell) to whom, being under many obligations, I take this public opportunity to acknowledge them; and, at the ſame time, to call upon him *verbo sacerdotis* (for ſuch he is, my Lords, and I hope not the worſe evidence in your Lordſhips eſtimation for his ſacerdotal character) to witneſs the truth of what I am going to ſay. While I was ruminating upon my heavy loſs and vexatious diſappointments, and wondering what ſecret enemy of my peace and tranquillity could have had the heart to commit this cruel depredation upon me, I received a letter from my worthy friend as before *ſpecified*, informing me that, on the very morning of the date of his letter, he had held a long conſultation with a very ſenſible and intelligent neighbour of his, an American loyaliſt, well acquainted with *Philadelphia*, and the *habits* and *capabilities* of that great rendezvous of Quakers, upon the ſubject of my ſtolen

* Where I obſerve the old fanatical and inſolent cant of *hireling miniſtry* is never forgotten, in ſpeaking of a Church the moſt reſpectable in Chriſtendom, and the grand bulwark of Proteſtantiſm.

turkey,

turkey, and moreover reporting the following very extraordinary circumstance:

During a short pause in the conversation between my worthy friend and his neighbour, as before *specified*, he (my friend, as above *specified* *) observed a sudden change, it seems, in the countenance of his neighbour, and such an agitation of his whole frame, as portended that something of *loud* importance was to be uttered. Nor was my friend mistaken; for in an instant his neighbour, as before *specified*, started from his seat, thumped upon the table, and, with the voice of a Stentor, exclaimed εὕρηκα! By ——— "B———'s turkey was stolen by the Quakers in revenge for his *Goliath slain* †."

Such a marvellous and instantaneous discovery, you will agree with me, my Lords, could not be *sine afflatu divino*. That my turkey was stolen by the Quakers, no body but an infidel can doubt; and the presumption is very strong, that, after a whole year's Quaker-cramming, the Editor of the British Critic was bribed to insert that wicked libel upon my sermon, and that the mercenary writer of the said libel was rewarded with a drumstick of it.

O blind to the future! that I should rear and feed this beautiful milk-white bird for the Christmas festivity of one of my best and most beloved friends, and that I could not foresee how the nicest parts of it were destined to pamper the luxurious appetite of an inimical British Editor, and that the last fragment of it was doomed to descend into the odious heterodox paunch of a d———n British Critic *.

And now, my Lords, having told you all my grievances, and brought all my complaints into your right honourable court, I appeal to your superior tribunal for redress, as far as it may be within your jurisdiction to grant it. I do not apply to your Lordships to tell me what particular Quaker was moved by the spirit, or deputed from the silent and secret council to commit this petty thievery; or whether the sly fox, whoever he was, did the wicked deed at the hour of twilight, midnight, or cock-crowing; for, though I am sensible that you are *wise men* in your way, I never heard that you were *wise men* in the way of recovering lost turkies, especially when stolen by the Quakers, who never impeach a *friend*.

But though you cannot restore my lost turkey, I hope you *can*, and I trust you *will*, restore me my quondam fast-day fame. My Lords, if you will deign to cast an eye upon the Orthodox Churchman's Review for February 1804, and compare it with the British Critic of November last, you will see from what a blaze of glory I have fallen, and under what a rude and dismal eclipse I have now the misfortune to stand.

To this my serio-comic appeal, my Lords, which, I fear, begins to weary your Lordships patience, will you permit me, in conclusion, to tack one short petition? which is, that you would be pleased to give that heterodox, disloyal, *gloomy November, Cork-skrew critic*, just one glorious Anti-Jacobin flagellation. If you would but for once do this *in your best manner*, my Lords, I think it

---

* From the frequent repetition of this word *specified*, hangs a secret between my friend and me.

† A literal fact, of which my friend and his neighbour, as before *specified*, are both ready to make affidavit before your Lordships, if required.

‡ Again theatrically speaking.

would

would make both him and Mr. Editor rue the day that ever they meddled with my ſermon, and, perhaps, might leave ſuch a qualm upon their ſtomachs, as to make them diſgorge my turkey back again upon the Quakers.

"Valete, viri doctiſſimi et illuſtriſſimi, pergite adverſarios Eccleſiæ cohibentes—pergite regis inimicos comprimentes—pergite porró criticos hoſce ineptos et nefarios caſtigantes, et in tali negotio diu et valdé deſidetato, ſint vobis omnia felicia et fauſta." J. B.

THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

I HAVE been greatly delighted and inſtructed, by your *reviews of reviewers*, and I have often felt regret that you do not beſtow a greater portion of your time and work in the execution of that moſt excellent part of your plan. It is obvious that you overlook many things worthy of notice, and that you hereby give an advantage to your opponents, which they ought not to poſſeſs, and of which I am certain that you are well qualified to deprive them.

It was by mere accident, and at diſtant intervals, that I met with three numbers of the *Christian Observer*, the editors of which I at once diſcovered to be earneſtly diſpoſed, and ſeriouſly determined, to undermine your credit, and to deſtroy your uſefulneſs, without being over faſtidious with reſpect to the means of accompliſhing their object. You certainly do not ſee that inſidious and hypocritical performance regularly. In one of the numbers which I ſaw many months ago, and to which I cannot now particularly refer, you are not only accuſed of *inconsistency*, but of ſomething which looks like downright *popery*, and of a ſerious wiſh to introduce *popiſh opinions* and *tyranny into the Church of England*. The charge of *inconsistency* is of great utility to theſe *pious* men. It will always produce a certain effect among their ignorant and credulous readers. It is capable of extenſive application in the random way in which they are accuſtomed to throw it out againſt all their opponents; and it requires no accuracy of detail or reference which would be particularly injurious to their cauſe. The charge of *popery*, &c. including that of being inimical to *proteſtant principles*, is alſo of great importance to them, becauſe popery is ſo frightful a thing as to be amply calculated to excite indignation, which *indignation, howsoever excited*, renders it altogether unneceſſary to enquire whether there is even the ſlighteſt ground for the odious accuſation.

The ſecond number of this precious work which came under my inſpection, is that which contains the review of Dr. *Gleig's Sermons*, to which you have ſo amply replied in your Appendix to Vol. XVIII. The third number is that for December laſt, in which I find ſtrictures on that able article by a correſpondent who ſigns ANTI-CALUMNY. From page 746 of this number, it appears that the article, in your Appendix, was alſo commented upon in the *Observer* for November, p. 699, which I have not ſeen. Permit me, therefore, to direct your attention to both theſe numbers. I am perſuaded, at the ſame time, that you would do well to look over the whole work, and to allow no future number to eſcape you; for, though the writers in the *Christian Observer profeſs* to be members and firm ſupporters of the eſtabliſhed Church, they endeavour, on all occaſions, as far as I can judge from the ſpecimens which I have ſeen, to repreſent you as peculiarly inimical

mical to her doctrines, in which I presume no true son of the Church of England will join them. I think it of real importance, therefore, that these vile insinuations and accusations should at length be stopped, or at least that the authors of them should be exposed to the world in their proper colours. Nor will this, on your part, be a difficult task: it is certainly necessary, and may be useful.

I have no wish to be represented or considered as a calumniator, and I am very certain that I seriously and sincerely detest calumny; but, at the risk of being so represented and considered by your opponents, (of whose good or bad opinion I am equally regardless,) I must say that, from the numbers which I have seen, I am compelled to look upon the *Christian Observers* as the most insidious enemies of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, of any writers whose works I have ever perused. That they are Calvinists in doctrine is avowed; *moderate*, indeed, they pretend to be; but *moderate Calvinism*, we are assured by their worthy coadjutors the editors of the *Gospel Magazine*, (see No. for Dec. 1804, p. 458,) is an absurdity totally indefensible; and the writings of the Christian Observers prove it to be so. It is, however, true that the shew of moderation, and the constant repetition of the claim to it, are amply calculated to produce their effect on careless readers; and, if Calvinism can be once propagated to any extent under this mask, the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England may, indeed, thereby fall; but it will appear unquestionable to every one who seriously and calmly considers the legitimate consequences of the conduct and principles of these observers, that *a comprehension of protestants* will, to their perfect satisfaction, supply the place of that doctrine which they pervert, and of that discipline which, for their own purposes only, they affect to admire. Thus your *popery*, Mr. Editor, which literally refers to the constitution of the Church, would be effectually got rid of; and the solemn league and covenant might be again established, *comprehending* all who are inimical to episcopacy, and friendly to the doctrines of fatalism. This comprehension of protestants is a favourite measure of the party, and to promote it, the constitution and laws of the Church have already, in numerous instances, been totally disregarded. In this way the *good Mr. Simeon*, while in Scotland, preached in episcopal chapels; in presbyterian kirks; in seceder meetings; in congregational assemblies; in the open air, and wherever he was permitted to descant on CONVERSION and ASSURANCE.

In the few numbers of the Observer which I have seen, I have discovered very little ability; but most ample amends are made for want of talents by indefatigable industry; by artful hypocrisy, and by gross and continued misrepresentation. Some of the greatest names, which have adorned the Church of England, have been pressed into the service of the party; and I entertain not a doubt, that if I should survive the present Bishop of Lincoln, and Mr. Daubeny, a very few years, I may find them in like manner appealed to, as supporting the same hopeful cause. This truly primitive and excellent author of the *Essay on the Church* is thus appealed to; and a pretended letter of *Charles Lesslie* is given in one of the three numbers which have fallen in my way, in which that admirable divine is made to support, in the most paltry common-place manner, the impious doctrines of *Calvinistic conversion* and *assurance*. I say, without hesitation, *pretended*, because most certainly Charles Leslie never entertained and never taught any such doctrines; it does require more than common (i. e. *Calvinistic*) *assurance* to

foist

foist such a letter upon the public, without the slightest evidence, as coming from his pen. The same candid men have laboured hard to prove, that our first reformers were Calvinists; and their assertions are so confident, and their appeal to facts so unreserved, that I can easily conceive their efforts to be eminently successful among such as choose not to enquire for themselves.

From the first article in the number for December, (on Justin Martyr,) I presume that these *worthy* Observers are now employed in *proving, after their manner*, that all the *ancient fathers* of the Church were Calvinists. To doubt the fact which they doubtless wish to establish will, I know, be considered as presumptuous heresy in me. I will, however, just venture to suggest, that if they were really possessed of the learning necessary for the enquiry, and of the moderation which they profess, they would, perhaps, find, that no doctrine was ever broached in the Church of Christ, approaching in the most distant manner to Calvinism, till the time of Augustine Bishop of Hippo. They would, perhaps, also find, from the same enquiry conducted with true moderation and impartiality, that this doctrine of Calvinism, which has bred so much mischief in the Church, was really borrowed from the fatalism of Pagan philosophy, and has been supported by the presumptuous reasonings of men vain in their own conceits; and that it has been derived, not from Scripture, but from "science, falsely so called." No man is better qualified, Mr. Editor, to set this matter in its proper light than you are; and I think you cannot perform a greater service to the Church of England in particular, and to the religious world in general, than by directing your attention to this subject, and by exposing the artful means by which these *Christian Observers* labour to mislead the public on the most important of all subjects.

Not having seen their number for November, I know nothing of their *comment* on the article in your Appendix; but from the *Strictures of* ANTI-CALUMNY, in the number before me, p. 763, and from the notes added to them, it is evident that they have felt the force of your observations, and that though determined, as their manner is on all occasions (for they doubtless think themselves infallible) not to yield, they are unable to refute them. ANTI-CALUMNY asserts that the Observers have "convicted you of repeated and glaring inconsistency," and of "frequently inculcating doctrines directly hostile to those of our established formularies." All this is easily understood—you are no Calvinist; and though a friend to unity in the Church, you do not look for it in their system of *comprehension*. But the *candid* correspondent having thrown out his general charge of *inconsistency*, &c. *cautiously* waves all particulars. In referring to your defence of *Dr. Gleig's Sermons*, he fills a part of three columns with garbled quotations in the usual and long-approved style of the party. In your article you support your censure by able reasoning and positive proofs. You exhibit a just and detailed character of the Christian Observer; and no man will call in question the propriety and justice of your reproofs, who calmly considers them in connection with, and as they so clearly result from, the detail and argument into which you have so largely entered. As your critical reproofs are insidiously strung together in the paper before me, from every part of your long article, and totally separated from your argument, which is never once referred to, they are calculated only to mislead; since nothing is more obvious than that that censure may be perfectly just and moderate in its proper place and connection, which, when disjoined from the context, and from the whole sub-

ject to which it refers, may appear harsh and severe. To this unfair "quotation of the *precise words*" of your review, are subjoined the woeful wailings of our pious correspondent. "Such (he says) are the frightful and accumulated epithets by which the abominations (of the Christian Observer) are displayed in one single article of the Anti-Jacobin." He then quotes the text: "Blessed are ye when men shall *revile* you," &c. which I hope you are ready to consider as a mark of his own *exceeding* modesty. He next denominates your censure "poison emitted most profusely." "Yet (continues he) the above precious *axungia* extracted from the venomous creature itself, will not only prove a complete specific in your case, but diminish its power of doing further mischief." He at length *quits metaphor*, and assures us that, after having written in such a way of the Christian Observer, you "will absolutely *say any thing*; and he demands "in what class of society persons are to be ranked, who, in differences in matters of common life, should thus exhaust language in expressions of malevolence, assail their antagonists through the medium of such accumulated falsehoods, and disembogue such a torrent of unqualified and unmerited abuse?" "Is this behaviour (he adds) to be endured? Is there a cause so deplorable as to need such advocates and the support of such means? Is there a Christian, is there a gentleman, who can countenance such outrageous calumny? Is it possible that, in Great Britain, in the 19th century, such writers should be endured?" Were the solemn league and covenant in force, you may guess, Mr. Editor, how you would be disposed of. This poor man who, in the midst of his deep distress, can derive no aid from argument, would then have it in his power to apply *some strictures* to you, which all *your arguments* would not, in that case, enable you to resist.

In the midst of these lamentations he assures us, without attempting to prove, that *your epithets*, as he calls them, (which he has forcibly and unfairly disjoined from their proper connection, to which he takes especial care never once to refer,) could only justly be applied to persons "*undermining* our holy religion;" to "abettors of the French regicides;" to the "disciples of the infamous Paine;" to the "converts of the absurd and blasphemous Godwin;" or, at any rate, "to those who have arrived at the half-way house of infidelity with Belsham and Geddes's," or to the "extravagant notions of visionary sectaries," &c. Whereas he asserts that the uniform object of the Christian Observer, "is the promotion of the *most pure and undefiled religion and morality*; and "that, in the *precise order*, and by the *very means*, appointed by our superiors;" that they are the "zealous supporters of our civil and religious establishments; that their theology, both in respect to doctrine and ecclesiastical government, is exactly that of the national confession; and that the only real difference between these writers (Christian Observers) and some other loyal subjects and learned ministers of the Church of England, is, that, on some points of faith, the former adhere *more closely* than the latter to the *plain and literal meaning* of the established creed; and, in consequence, inculcate a *more strict* system of religion and morals." I hope, Mr. Editor, you will consider this as at least a decent specimen of *modest assurance*. The pious, candid, modest writer "challenges even malevolence itself *fairly* to prove the contrary" of what he has here asserted in favour of his friends; including, as you will doubtless observe, one of the broadest and vilest calumnies on the great body of the clergy, which malevolence itself ever suffered.

I presume that this modest man and his worthy clients cannot be entirely ignorant

ignorant of the history of our articles and of our Church; and that though they have at various times laboured hard to mislead the public mind on this subject, they are not themselves completely satisfied of the truth of their positions. They cannot prove even in their own manner, and I hope they dare not openly assert, that *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, who framed the articles, were Calvinists, or maintained their darling doctrines of *conversion* and *assurance*. They cannot point out a single period at which the clergy of the Church of England, or even a majority of them, were generally reputed Calvinists; and they may recollect many during which the Calvinists were extremely dissatisfied with the national confession. Were it possible to lead men who so quickly perceive the mote in their brother's eye, to take notice of the beam in their own, they would, perhaps, discover, that the principles which they so obstinately recommend, have bred more mischief in the Church of England, than any other; that the peaceable establishment of the reformation was first disturbed by them; and that the disturbance has been incessantly renewed by them ever since. Whatever may be the artful pretences of its abettors, experience has amply proved that Calvinism, in any shape, as it is inconsistent with the doctrine, is uniformly inimical to the discipline and worship of the established Church. At all events no fact in history is more certain than this, that at no one period have Calvinistic principles been allowed by the majority of our clergy to be the genuine doctrine of our articles, and most decidedly not at present. The Christian Observers have used very harsh and impertinent language in speaking of Dr. Kipling, Mr. Daubeny, &c. but they are not yet entitled to assert that they have confuted them. And the wailings of their correspondent on the subject of the article in your Review, prove to me that he feels the weakness of his cause, but that, unwilling to give it up, he is eager to support it by any prop he can find.

The Church of England has been greatly alarmed by the recent conduct of some violent sectaries and schismatics, both within and out of the Church; and there is so much acknowledged justice in the alarm, that they who prudently wish to support and disseminate the inimical doctrines which have excited it, must, of necessity, for their own credit, in order to lull suspicion, and for the better promotion of their favourite purpose, act cautiously and with dissimulation. Such is the conduct of the Christian Observers; their attachment to the Church is hollow and affected for the very purpose of extending the influence of sectarian prejudice and enthusiasm. Yet these hypocrites betray their holy mother with a kiss; for that their views tend directly to *undermine* our Church, and to leave her without a defence against sectaries in general, and Calvinists in particular, (who have ever been her most pernicious enemies,) is evident (however anxiously they labour to conceal it) from every article of theirs which I have read. There is an article pre-eminently remarkable in this number for December, p. 730, which will amply prove this to every unprejudiced reader. It is from a correspondent who signs SCRUTATOR, and is intended to exalt the character of Mr. Baxter, who has always been a peculiar favourite of the party; and who, because he really was episcopally ordained, is uniformly and pertinaciously represented as an ornament of the Church of England; though it is universally known that no man ever more zealously and more scandalously opposed her discipline and worship than he did. SCRUTATOR begins by giving evidence to his piety and worth from Bishops *Gauden*, *Stillingfleet*, *Patrick*, &c. &c. Such an appeal, to the most respectable authority,

is a common trick of our Obſervers; and, as it is always eaſy to ſuppreſs what is not to their purpoſe, it is a moſt uſeful contrivance. The evidence here brought forward may poſſibly contain the truth ſo far, but *certainly not the whole truth*, which *whole truth* will, I am very certain, never be allowed to appear in the pages of the Chriſtian Obſerver. Scrutator next refers to ſome of Baxter's works, and among others to his *Saint's everlasting reſt*. It would have been amuſing, and not unintereſting, to his readers, if, under this head, he had informed them that this *worthy Calvinist*, in the editions of that work, which were publiſhed during the grand rebellion, *admitted into heaven of his own authority*, ſeveral of the moſt notorious rebels and regicides; and that after the reſtoration he *cautiously dropped them out again*. Scrutator kindly furniſhes us with ſome extracts from *Baxter's Narrative of his Life and Times*, from which, compared with the general character, principles, and conduct of the man, I think the neceſſary concluſion is, that he was a vain turbulent man in regular times, and a time-ſerving hypocrite in times of commotion. It appears at leaſt that he, whoſe tender conſcience could not afterwards allow him to ſubmit to the diſcipline and worſhip of the Church, was very much at his eaſe during the rebellion, and *piously* thought that the parliament meant no harm to Charles, even after they had completely annihilated his authority and turned the kingdom upſide down. He and his friends, he ſays, "were unfeignedly for king and parliament." "We took the true happineſs of king and people, Church and ſtate, to be our end; and ſo we UNDERSTOOD THE COVENANT, engaging both againſt Papiſts and Schiſmatics." Muſt not the conſcience of that man be ſingularly tender, and his perception of the *literal and grammatical sense* of a ſolemn deed, particularly quick and exact, who could thus underſtand the ſolemn league and covenant? And muſt not he be conſidered as wonderfully ſincere in his attachment to the Church of England, who had ſolemnly ſworn to extirpate the government, diſcipline, and worſhip, by which ſhe has always been diſtinguiſhed? And in what light are we to look upon writers who ſupport ſuch a character? Are they real friends, or decided, though artful, enemies of the Church? On this ſubject, at leaſt, Mr. Baxter was no hypocrite. He openly avowed his diſlike of our eccleſiaſtical polity, of our worſhip, and of thoſe principles which the great body of our clergy have always maintained to be thoſe of our articles. He conſidered the conſtitution and worſhip of our Church as popiſh. Let us not, therefore, be deceived by the pretences of the Chriſtian Obſervers. In ſpite of their diſſimulation, it is obvious that they think on this head as he did. Though they preſume that the beſt way of furthering the great end in view, is to conceal, as much as poſſible, the cloven foot. It would, however, without all doubt, be more honourable to ſpeak at once; and if the Chriſtian Obſervers would do ſo, though I ſhould ſtill reject and oppoſe their principles, I ſhould feel more reſpect for them than I can poſſibly do at preſent.

The obſtinate and unbluſhing impudence with which the Chriſtian Obſervers ſupport unfair concluſions from the writings of their opponents, was never more ably or candidly expoſed than by Mr. Daubeny, of which a ſummary account may be ſeen in his *Guide to the Church*, 2d Edit. Vol. II. p. 374. et ſeq. Had I been convicted of ſuch unfair dealing, and of ſuch foul prevarication to ſupport it, if I had not had candour enough to acknowledge my fault, I hope I ſhould have had modeſty enough never more to meddle with the man who had ſo clearly convicted me of moſt egregious injuſtice. But the reſtleſs preſumptuous ſect of *true Churchmen* is not made

up

up of blushing materials. In this number for December, they review Mr. *Daubeny's Trial of the Spirits*; and, in the first paragraph of page 757, they obstinately persist in referring to their former misrepresentations, as if nothing had been done to obviate their silly calumnies. Such conduct as this cannot, in my estimation, be marked with too strong a degree of reprobation. They are compelled, however, to bestow some praise, which they take care to qualify as usual, by crying out *inconsistency* with positions elsewhere maintained by the same author. But their own *consistent sectarian spirit* is deeply grieved with numerous passages, and particularly with one criticism of the learned Archdeacon. He has translated the words of St. Paul to the Ephesians, τας μεθοδιας του Διαβολου, (which, in the authorized version, are rendered "*wiles* of the Devil,") "*methodisms of the Devil.*" They are greatly shocked by this translation; it cuts them to the quick; and, besides, it puts them in mind of the Anti-Jacobin, which first made use of the same term; and the very recollection of the Anti-Jacobin Review appears to fill their godly minds with horror. I trust the learned and acute defender of Dr. Gleig will soon furnish them with further matter for lamentation and outcry.

When I first read their review of Dr. Gleig's sermons, I was forcibly struck with the idea that it came from some personal enemy of the Doctor; from some illiberal, envious, and hypocritical Calvinist of the North; and *really* I think so still. Perhaps, nay, I think, probably the lamentable wailings of ANTI-CALUMNY proceed from the same quarter. But, *indeed*, it would have been well for him and his friends, if they had seriously, calmly, and candidly weighed the defence before they ventured again to commit themselves on the subject. For, if I mistake not greatly, *Edmund-hall, and all the other halls and colleges, of Calvinistic notoriety*, furnish no match for the Anti-Jacobin Reviewer. They may sigh, and cry, and wail, and recriminate, and aid themselves by a hypocritical appeal to this authority and the other, but they are not the men capable of refuting his reasoning.

ANTI-CALUMNY repeats the charge of heresy brought by the Christian reviewer, and he appeals in support of the charge to the feeble and indecisive language of the *British Critics*, in their review of Dr. Gleig's sermons. Now this is a pertinent example of their fallacious mode of appealing to the authority of others. The British Critic is a work of high merit, but the article to which they refer is feebly written, and it is obvious that the reviewer, whoever he may have been, entered not even in thought so far into the subject, as to entitle or enable him to judge of its merits. He suspects something which he does not take time either to establish or to refute; but he has so much respect for Dr. Gleig's character and principles (sufficiently as they are known to all men acquainted with the literature of the day), as not to wish to establish a charge of heresy on a doubtful expression. But had this zealous correspondent been acquainted, as he ought to be, and probably is with the British Critic, and disposed to refer to the same authority, when it opposes, as when he thinks it agrees with him, he would have seen that the Editors of that excellent and useful work, could with no sort of consistency reject Dr. Gleig's principles, as stated in his sermons, since the very same principles are most ably and luminously, and incontrovertibly established in the review of (the Observer's precious friend) *Overton's book*. See particularly the second part of that masterly review. A. C. further goes on to report, at great length, and with great vehemence, the contrariety of Mr. Cooper's sentiments to those of Dr. Gleig. But all this is really no-

thing to the purpoſe, either on the one ſide or on the other. If the Chriſtian Obſerver, who reviewed Dr. Gleig's ſermons live, as I ſuſpect, in Scotland, and be acquainted with that gentleman's character and other writings, he ought to have known, that he is no heretic; and that he has never ſupported any heterodox doctrine, unleſs to diſſent from Calviniſm be herely. If he be not acquainted with the Doctor's character in private, and with his other writings, in this caſe a candid peruſal of his ſermons would have taught him the ſame thing. Inſulated quotations, even from Scripture, may prove any thing which the quoter pleaſes: St. Paul may be made to contradict himſelf, and to oppoſe the Goſpel which he preached. This is a poſition which I am inclined to hope the Obſervers will not deny. It is at leaſt certain, that they and their party derive great aid to their cauſe by faithfully and conſtantly reducing it to practice. But unleſs they be really infallible, Dr. G. when candidly interpreted is no heretic, and unleſs Calviniſm be the authoritative, and univerſally received doctrine of the Church of England, he oppoſes no fundamental articles of that Church. All men who know Dr. G., know certainly, that unleſs the interpretation of *John Calvin* have ſuperſeded the Goſpel, his faith and principles are perfectly ſound; and every impartial man who reads his volume of ſermons will be convinced of the ſame. It is perfectly in character, indeed, that notwithſtanding the ingenious defence in the Anti-Jacobin Review, the Chriſtian Obſervers ſhould ſtill hold to their old opinion, becauſe nothing is ſo obſtinate as *ſectarian prejudice*; nor is it at all ſurpriſing that they reject the aid of *Biſhop Bull's works*; for though, perhaps, they dare not yet venture to aſſert it, they doubtleſs conſider that illuſtrious prelate as equally heretical with Dr. G. and his defender; and as I am really a friend to unanimity, in this ſentiment I heartily agree with them. But what would theſe reſtleſs *waſpiſh** men have? I hope my profeſſion of ſincerity and honour will be allowed to be of equal value with theirs. With you, Mr. Editor, I am confident it will, and I humbly truſt it will be equally ſo at a higher tribunal than either yours or theirs. In the preſent caſe, I am a volunteer, and probably I may be eſteemed both by him whom I defend, and by thoſe whom I oppoſe as but a weak one. But I feel myſelf fully able and entitled to bear witneſs to a plain matter of fact. Whether the Doctor will diſcover who I am I know not: I ſhould rather wiſh at the preſent moment that he did not. But certainly, not becauſe I am aſhamed of the teſtimony I am about to give. To high talents or learning I have no pretenſions; but neither have the Chriſtian Obſervers any title to *pretend* to either; ſo that in this reſpect we are equal; while even *my modeſty*, which has ſometimes been conſidered as exceſſive, will not permit me to lower my integrity to the humble ſtandard to which their writings have in my eſtimation lowered theirs. I entertain no principle, affection, or ſentiment, which I have any wiſh, or am under any obligation, to conceal or to repreſent under any other colour, than as it exiſts in my own mind. If I have any knowledge of human nature, and I

---

* The Editor of Biſhop *Bramhall's Vindication of himſelf and the Epiſcopal Clergy from the Preſbyterian Charge of Popery, as managed by Mr. Baxter in his Grotian religion*, obſerves, that this good Biſhop, "more eſpecially raiſed the choler, and enraged the zeal of the Geneva faction; that *waſpiſh* ſect being according to the humour and ſpirit of their founder, never able to bear the leaſt affront or contradiction."

have

have examined it minutely under various forms, I more than ſuſpect that the Chriſtian Obſervers entertain many principles, affections, and ſentiments which they dare not avow; and many which they are obliged to conceal or to repreſent under other colours to the very verge of falſehood: and I have reaſon almoſt to know that there are ſome of them, or ſome of their claſs, in ſituations which compel them to reſort to that concealment which deceives thoſe whom no honeſt man would deceive; and to that prevarication from the guilt and meanneſs of which all the *ſpirit* of Calviniſm will not be able to cleanſe them, at leaſt in the eſtimation of honourable and religious men.

Notwithſtanding the frequently repeated charge of hereſy, I am not aſhamed to confeſs, that I have known Dr. Gleig intimately for many years. I do not always live in Scotland, and he is ſeldom out of it. But I have often had occaſion, to my great comfort and inſtruction, to paſs much time in his ſociety in the moſt free and unreſerved manner, and I flatter myſelf that I enjoy ſome portion of his eſteem, friendſhip, and confidence. I have heard him, at various periods, and at diſtant intervals, talk on all the moſt important ſubjects which can occupy the attention of a man and a Chriſtian; and that without premeditation or reſtraint: Yet heard I him never utter one ſentiment, nor attempt to eſtabliſh one principle, which by any power of fair logic, I could torture into hereſy, or conſider as oppoſed to any doctrine of the Goſpel, or article of the Church of England. His talents and learning are well known, and juſtly allowed to be of the higheſt claſs, and all men, who know him, know that the Church of England numbers not, among all her ſons, a more zealous friend. His talents and his learning have often been employed with equal ability and effect, in defending her doctrines and conſtitution againſt falſe friends and open enemies of various deſcriptions; and there are few, if any, in the age in which we live, better qualified, and none more cordially diſpoſed to ſupport her principles and polity than he, who is thus idly and wickedly held up to the reprobation of *Chriſtian Obſervers*. I flatter myſelf, that I have ſome practical knowledge of the Church of England; but of all her Clergy whom I know, and I know many—I know not one, and of all thoſe of whom I have heard, I know but few, who deſerve better of that Church than Dr. Gleig, and the favours which I think he has conferred upon her, are certainly the more valuable and the more praiſe-worthy, as they are perfectly gratuitous: they are the effects of conviction, and of the love of truth, and have been conferred with no intereſted motive, and without the hope of fee or reward.

When we come to ſtate the creed of this eminent writer, we ſhall indeed have reaſon to be aſtoniſhed at the audacity of his Chriſtian accuſers. He profeſſes (and I think myſelf fully entitled to teſtify the private ſincerity of his public profeſſion) firmly to believe the doctrine of the ever bleſſed Trinity, as ſtated in our articles and creeds. He teaches that man was created in a ſtate of innocence; and that he was deſtined to immortality if he had obeyed the poſitive law to which the Almighty was pleaſed to ſubject him. He believes, indeed, that even then, this immortality would have been conferred as a free gift, not as the juſt reward of human merit, that the grace of God was even then neceſſary, as it is now; and that though man could forfeit immortality only by one act, it does not neceſſarily nor certainly follow, that all individual men would have been for ever free from every ſpecies of immorality. I know no doctrine of the Goſpel or of our Church, which this belief in any reſpect oppoſes. But he farther believes,

that Adam and Eve fell; and that by their fall they forfeited immortality, both for themſelves and their poſterity. The ſecond perſon of the glorious Trinity was pleaſed to offer himſelf a ranſom for man, and by the atonement which he made for us, are we reſtored to that which our firſt parents forfeited? In purchaſing for us *eternal life*, which the Scriptures poſitively aſſert to be the *gift of God*, Dr. Gleig excludes all human merit and works in terms the moſt expreſs and poſitive. In fitting us for that immortality, which the propitiation of the Son of God alone has procured for us, he conſiders the grace of God as abſolutely and indiſpenſibly neceſſary; but he alſo believes, as the Scriptures teach, that we may RESIST *that grace*, and *grieve the Spirit of God*; that we are not mere machines; that the grace of God is offered *unto* ALL *men*; and that if any periſh, they will periſh by their own fault. He believes that human works have no merit whatever, in procuring for us that life and immortality, which Jeſus Chriſt has brought to light by his Goſpel; but he believes that we muſt obey the Goſpel in order to fit us for the manſions of eternal bliſs. He no where denies or doubts that we are weak and inclined to evil; but he poſitively and firmly believes with the Scriptures, that God's grace is ſufficient for us, and ſince he has promiſed, with every temptation, to furniſh us (if we are willing to be led) with a way to eſcape, that we may be ſaved: he concludes, that whoever fails to attain this ſalvation, will have himſelf alone to blame. It is therefore of no conſequence whatever to us, whether our natural powers be indeed leſs perfect than thoſe of our firſt parents, ſince we are poſitively aſſured that the means of ſalvation are, by the gracious bounty of God, and the atonement of his Son, placed in our own power. I muſt again own that I know not one doctrine of the Goſpel or of the Church, or one juſt inference from either that is oppoſed by this creed. I will therefore venture to repeat, that Dr. G. did not mean to oppoſe the doctrine of original ſin; but that he had reaſon, at the ſame time, in his view of the ſubject, to aſſert that "it is not eaſy to conceive a queſtion of leſs importance:" While I will preſume to add, at the evident riſk of a violent cry of inconſiſtency and hereſy, that *it is not easy to conceive a more pernicious doctrine than that of original sin*, as it is appealed to, explained and aſſerted by Calviniſtic divines. Whoever is at all converſant with the world, muſt have ſeen, that all the vices, to which men are liable, are excuſed or extenuated in ſome way or other, by an appeal to the original corruption of our nature; and I have known many individuals, and claſſes of men, eſpecially *enthusiasts* and *true churchmen*, rendered perfectly eaſy in the habitual breach of known duties (which other men religiouſly perform), under the conviction, that they are the *unavoidable reſult of our corrupted and fallen nature*. But, however, this may be, I am inclined to think that the Chriſtian Obſervers will find it difficult, amidſt all the hereſies which have been recorded and anathematiſed in the Church, to find one under which Dr. Gleig may be claſſed—a man who thus unequivocally believes the whole doctrine of the Goſpel. But is he not at variance with our articles? I ſay no; and will continue to repeat it, unleſs they can be proved as they never have been, nor can be, to be ſtrictly Calviniſtical. When, indeed, his creed is compared with the *peſtilent hereſy of John Calvin*, as Dr. Dupin terms it, it muſt by Calviniſts be eſteemed heretical; but we have heard, that there are diſeaſed eyes, which repreſent all things as yellow, without affecting the real colour of the objects.

But what right have theſe inſolent unknown cenſors to erect their own interpretation into authority, and then to aſſert that Dr. Gleig, becauſe he

rejects

rejects it, rejects alſo the doctrines of the Church of England? I preſume Dr. G. has ſubſcribed the articles of the Church, as well as they, and I am inclined to give at leaſt *equal* credit to his integrity. When he ſubſcribed them he had neither temporal honor nor emolument in view; his ſubſcription was perfectly voluntary, and might have been withheld, without any injury whatever, either to his fame or his fortune. Who ſhall dare then, in ſuch circumſtances, to aſſert, that he prevaricated or ſubſcribed that of which he did not believe the *literal grammatical ſenſe* and *conſtruction?* I wiſh, with all my heart, that the Chriſtian Obſervers, with all their fair pretences, may be able to quiet their conſciences as eaſily on this head. They have fortunately informed us, how their *good friend Mr. Baxter* UNDERSTOOD *the ſolemn league and covenant*; and it is more than probable that their *literal* and *grammatical* interpretation of public writings is of a ſimilar caſt with his. It is at leaſt obvious and certain, that their ſubſcription to the articles of the Church of England, was not quite ſo voluntary as that of Dr. G.; and they have probably derived, or hope to derive, temporal advantages, which he neither has nor hopes for. If they would let other men alone, they might enjoy their darling principles for me (however abſurd and hurtful I certainly eſteem them) in perfect tranquillity. They may be honeſt men, though they do not appear to me to write as ſuch, and I would willingly indulge the hope for their own ſakes, that they are ſo; but they have ſubſcribed the articles of the Church of England in a ſenſe in which I would not ſubſcribe them for the whole revenue of the Church and of the empire; becauſe I find that (calviniſtical) ſenſe neither in Scripture nor in the literal meaning of the articles, nor in the general hiſtory and opinions of our Church. If indeed they gave their *conſcience no wrench* on the occaſion, it will be well for them, and certainly not the worſe for me. But I would entreat them to accuſtom themſelves ſometimes to the reflection, that Dr. Gleig, and they who think with him, may have ſubſcribed with at leaſt equal integrity; and that though their opinions differ widely from thoſe of the Chriſtian Obſervers and of John Calvin, it does not follow of courſe, that they are contrary to the doctrines of *the Goſpel and of the Church of England.*

And now, Mr. Editor, I have done with theſe men, I imagine for ever. Chance alone brought the numbers of their Miſcellany, on which I have commented, into my hands, and I may probably never ſee another page of their writing; in which caſe they will have it in their power to ſay whatever they pleaſe of me, with little danger of any reply. But as their precious time is ſo much occupied in hunting for hereſy on the one hand, and on the other in ſearching for authorities on which to reſt their doctrines, and by means of which to diſſeminate them more widely, I once thought of furniſhing them with an anſwer ready made to their hands; and which would have had at leaſt one advantage, that I ſhould myſelf have ſeen it. But I have not now time, and I preſume you would not willingly ſpare me room for ſo precious a work; and as they are certainly more accuſtomed to ſuch labour, they will execute it better than I ſhould. Some of the materials of ANTI-CALUMNY's letter will do tolerably well, but they muſt be new mixed, and differently arranged. The nouns *inconſiſtency, calumny, hereſy, popery, epithets, abominations, poiſon, abuſe, malevolence, falſehoods*, &c. together with the Latin word *axungia*, which they will probably condeſcend to tranſlate, may be combined in various ways, and preſented to their readers with proper verbs and adjectives, &c. and repeated

peated at leaſt fifty times with equal juſtice and effect. They may aſſure their readers, that I am an infidel and a regicide in diſguiſe; or at leaſt they may put it in their power to draw ſome ſuch concluſion. By quotations from my paper properly ſtrung together, in their beſt manner, they may exhibit me as a monſter of iniquity, perhaps as the grand deceiver. There are paſſages, in this letter of mine, which even I, though worſe than a novice in ſuch works, could ſo garble as to frighten the *worthy readers* of the *Christian Observer* almoſt out of their wits. But they will certainly do the buſineſs better: after they have made me as black and as frightful as they can, they may inſinuate that probably I am Dr. Gleig himſelf; or if it be neceſſary to conſider us as different perſons, they may aſſert with as much juſtice, as they have aſſerted many other things, that we write in concert; that we have combined to overturn the Church and State of England; and that we have exhibited one of our firſt and grandeſt efforts towards that object in this our *unmerited* attack on *Christian Observers* and *True Churchmen*. But I will no further attempt to inſtruct them in that in which they have ſo much practice, and in which they are ſo much better able to inſtruct me, if I were willing to exerciſe ſo dirty a trade. There is a virtue or a temper of mind (inferring the moſt exalted virtue) which Chriſtianity ſtrongly recommends, which it prefers to talents and gifts, and virtue and knowledge of every kind and degree. In Goſpel language it is called CHARITY. In that I would gladly inſtruct them; and ſuch inſtruction, as it is greatly neceſſary, would certainly be more important to them than all their other acquirements. But I greatly fear they are not yet diſpoſed to learn its true nature, nor to acquire its genuine practice. I never yet found a downright thorough paced Calviniſt who was ſo diſpoſed, and I have known many of that claſs in various quarters. Yet I mean them well, when I beg them to reflect what CHARITY really means, and to what it tends, and to believe that it is ſuperior (both with reſpect to preſent comfort and future hope) to all the *gifts* and *knowledge*, and *convictions*, and *converſions*, and *aſſurances*, of *Calviniſtic theology* *."

I ever am, Mr. Editor,

With greateſt reſpect, your's, &c.

ANTIHYPOCRITE.

Martyrdom of King Charles the First,
30th January, 1805.

---

* Were I to live to ſee any certain marks of *genuine Chriſtian charity* among theſe Obſervers and their friends, both within and without the eſtabliſhment, I ſhould indeed begin to augur well for the peace of our Zion. A ſtop would then be put to the growth of that *Phariſaic leaven*, which has been the cauſe of ſo much animoſity and miſchief in our Church and nation, and which is ſo oppoſite to the mild and humble and candid ſpirit of the Goſpel. We might thus hope to ſee that pernicious weed, which is not originally of Engliſh growth, at length annihilated or retranſplanted to its native climate. But, alas, the ſimpleſt ſpecies of Calviniſm, if any of theſe can be ſimple, including, as they all do, more or leſs, their pretended gifts of the ſpirit and convictions, converſions and aſſurances, are ſadly oppoſite to this divine grace; and they are ſo ſtrongly ſupported by certain infirmities of our nature, as to require more than human power to eradicate them from any ſoil in which their growth has been once encouraged.

MISCEL-

MISCELLANEOUS.

ANTI-SCIOLUS ON THE REMARKS OF PHOSPHILOS, ON THE BYRSA OF VIRGIL.

Pereant qui ante nos noſtra dixerunt.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

I COULD not help obſerving, though I thought it hardly worth while to trouble you, or your readers, with the remark, that *Phoſphilos* might very well have ſaved himſelf the labour of his former communication (See Vol. XVIII. p. 436.) as well as the *miſtake* of ſuppoſing that his was a "*new* illuſtration of a paſſage in Virgil's Georgics IV. 287," if he had fortunately conſulted Martyn's learned and entertaining notes on the ſubject, wherein the profeſſor has expreſsly referred to the opinion of Huetius, ſo nearly ſimilar to that of your correſpondent, as far as I underſtand the latter, that I was a little ſurprized at his not being aware of it. But his laſt attempt at claſſical elucidation (ſee page 106) is really ſuch a ſpecimen of pedantic and literary trifling, as ſeems hardly to require the detection and ridicule, which it nevertheleſs ſo juſtly deſerves.

Every ſchool-boy, I thought, had known that *Byrſa* was the *citadel* of Carthage, and that moſt citadels were "*fortified places;*" and, if he were at a loſs for the etymology of the word, he might eaſily have found it, as well as Phoſphilos himſelf, in the argument of the IVth Book of the Æneid, in the Delphin Virgil, not *a very uncommon* ſchool-book! in the notes of the Variorum edition of Juſtin, as well as fifty other places, for ought I know; and, to come to a little more plain reading, even in ſuch a very common and uſeful book as "Riſum Teneatis Amici!" Ainſworth's Latin and Engliſh Dictionary!!! who has literally given us, in leſs than *three of his ſhort lines*, all the information with which, as a profound diſcovery of his own, Phoſphilos has contrived to occupy not leſs than three *of your cloſely-printed pages*.

"Byrſa (ſays the well known lexicographer) ad mentem fabulæ, a Byrſa corium, cum *revera eſt vocal. Punic. a* בצרח *arx vel caſtellum.*" And, after the explanation that is contained in the note of Servius, *in loco*, to which, unfortunately for the critic's etymological fame, our old friend, Ainſworth, again refers us, viz. that *Magalia*, or *Magaria*, is derived from "Magar; quod Punica lingua villam ſive caſam ſignificat." where was the neceſſity of ſuch an idle parade of Greek and Hebrew learning to prove that theſe "*villæ*, or "*caſæ*, were not the mere "huts or temporary dwellings of the Numidians," but "the habitations of the common citizens of Carthage, the private houſes about, or around the citadel in which the bulk of the inhabitants dwelled." Whether or not they were afterwards ſurrounded by an outer wall, appears to be wholly immaterial; but that they gave a name to that part of the city, as we now ſpeak of "*the ſuburbs*" of a place, we unqueſtionably have not *firſt learned* from your correſpondent.

So much for the critic's etymological reſearches. In thoſe which he has made into hiſtory and chronology, if not more fortunate, he is at leaſt, it muſt be confeſſed, far more *original;* for he recommends "an aſſiduous inveſtigation of the *Chriſtians*, not only poſterior to, but *contemporary with, the foundation of Carthage.*" But here, Mr. Editor, muſt certainly be ſome miſtake

take, perhaps of the preſs, as there is in the word "concluſive" juſt before; and I ſhall therefore ſay no more about it, as leading thoſe, who may have erroneouſly depended on the poet, "much nearer the truth;" and then immediately quotes *Strabo* and *Appian* on the ſubject. From the former of whom, or rather from Phoſphilos's tranſlation, "we gather (he kindly tells us) that *Byrſa* was a lofty *turret*, which had a temple *at the top* dedicated to Æſculapius;" and afterwards, "that this temple *in Byrſa* was the richeſt and nobleſt edifice in all Carthage, and that 900 fugitives defended it for ſome time after *Byrſa* itſelf was ſurrounded." Rather a ſingular idea Phoſphilos ſeems to have conceived of *a turret with ſuch a temple ſtuck upon the top of it*; or, as he afterwards tells us, ſhut up *in the middle of it*. But the word "turret" itſelf is much ſuch another tranſlation of ὄφρυς (I preſume not ὀφθυς) in Strabo, as "Mercury finding Æneas building citadels or towers *in Magalia*," is of the paſſage he has juſt after quoted from Virgil.

Such, Mr. Editor, are the labours and the diſcoveries of this learned critic, who, to uſe his own moſt elegant form of expreſſion, thinks himſelf "able to *ſtagger*, if not to ſubvert, an etymological explication, bearing no ſmall degree of ſpecioufneſs and plauſibility, a derivation which has been *ſtabilitated* by the greateſt number of partizans;" and that, "without bewildering the mind in the mazes of *metaphyſical* ſubtleties, confounding the underſtanding by *digreſſive* circumlocution, (only that he, in the very next two lines, runs into a digreſſion as formal and unneceſſary as it is inconcluſive and ridiculous, which he takes as the *firſt ſtep* towards a *regular* inquiry, and from which he does not return till he has abſolutely divided it into '*firſtly* and *ſecondly*,') or forcing reluctant conviction by blinding reaſon." Of all which this is a very fair ſpecimen, as his whole letter is more than a ſufficient proof. Do, pray Mr. Editor, if you ſhould have reaſon to think that Phoſphilos means to favour you again, at leaſt beg him, while he is throwing ſo much *borrowed* light on the *learned languages*, not ſo miſerably to corrupt and darken his own *mother tongue*.

ANTI-SCIOLUS.

POETRY.

The following Verſes were received too late to be added to our Review of Wilkes's Life and Correſpondence, and are therefore placed under their appropriate Head.

MR. EDITOR,

AS Mr. Wilkes's friends (God keep me from ſuch friends) have choſen to ſtir up the aſhes of that extinguiſhed volcano, perhaps the Verſes I encloſe may be conſidered as no bad accompaniment to your Review of their publications.

G.

ODE* *to the worthy Voters for* JOHN WILKES, *Eſq. when he ſtood for the City of London.*

HAIL, freedom's pillars! firm and ſtrong;
Your darling John demands my ſong,
Fair *Liberty's* defender.

* Theſe verſes were, during the time of the election, ſent to various newſpapers, but the publiſhers were ſo *mob-awed* that, as far as the writer recollects, they were never inſerted in any.

Hail

Hail patriots! obſtinately brave,
Who high on *faction's* turbid wave
Rais'd your *mob-blown* pretender.

Boldly I juſtify your choice;
Loud let me raiſe my willing voice,
And ſing your *hero's* praiſe.
Come Muſe from Temple's friendly grove,
Diſplay thy wit, ſhew all thy love,
And aid my feeble lays.

Hey boys, for *Wilkes and Liberty!*
Let loud huzzas rend earth and ſky—
Tremble ye *Laws* and *Kings!*—
From Jack to Tom the cry rebounds,
For *mob*, when play'd on, loudly ſounds,
Like other *empty* things.

Old *Chaos* rears his drouzy head,
Wild *Anarchy* from Poland * fled,
Swears that with us ſhe'll dwell.
The dauntleſs *weavers*† joyful ſing
"A fig for Parliament and King"—
Noll almoſt ſmiles in hell.

Who dares pronounce Wilkes is not fit
In Houſe of Commons high to ſit,
A member for the City?
None ſure—to fruſtrate your intents,
Like member, like conſtituents,
Wou'd be a wond'rous pity.

'Tis true, *religion* he has *none*—
Like *patriotiſm* he'll *put it on:*
A change of cloaks is pleaſant.
Beſides, unbias'd, he may chuſe
A good religion, *fit for uſe,*
For you, who've none at preſent.

What matchleſs honeſty is his!
They ſay he never bilk'd a Miſs,
(And he's had many ſcores.)

---

* Poland at the time was in a ſtate of anarchy.

† The late Duke of Bedford was a favourite with the mob for no diſcoverable reaſon. It ſurely could not be becauſe he fed his oxen and ſheep at ſuch an expenſe, and ſold them ſo dear that none but the *rich* could *purchaſe*; and ſo overloaded them with fat, that, when bought, they were *uneatable*. His grandfather was, at the time alluded to in the verſes, the object of popular hatred on equally ſlender grounds. A mob of Spitalfields weavers attacked his houſe in Bloomſbury-ſquare, and had not he made his eſcape, would have ſacrificed his grace to that blind rage which is the governing principle of all mobs.

They did their work, receiv'd their pay—
Perhaps his *creditors* will ſay
" Wou'd we had *been* his *wh——s!*"

In Freedom's glorious cauſe he fought,
In fields of danger boldly ſought
His dear, dear country's good.
Juſt fail'd to ſet us by the ears—
Now, mortified, exclaims with tears
" I did whate'er I cou'd!"

Aye, that you did, good, honeſt John!
When, peerleſs, o'er the reſt you ſhone,
And gave your King *the lie.*
But what are laws, and truth, and Kings?
Mean, flimſy, cobweb, *Scotch-gauze* things
To *thy* dear liberty.

Away with * Harley, and the reſt!—
They ſure can never ſtand the teſt
With Liberty's great *martyr:*
Who ſays, by bold ambition ſpurr'd,
That " neck or nothing is the word,
The *gallows,* or the *garter!*"

You are the *body,* he the *ſoul*—
Then chuſe him, and, while planets roll,
The *mob* your praiſe ſhall roar.
Chuſe *only* him, for *he* alone
Can amply fill your *fourfold* throne—
Alone he's more than *four!*

In him your own lov'd virtues join,
In him united brighter ſhine,
And glorious radiance give.
By all already 'tis decreed
That, chuſing HIM, you'll chuſe indeed
A REPRESENTATIVE! G.

To JOHN WILKES, *Eſq. on his ſaying that not only St. Andrew, but his Church alſo were inauſpicious to him* †.

UNGRATEFUL John! full well you know
To good St. Andrew *all* you owe—

---

* The honourable Mr. Harley, the late father of the City, was then one of the candidates.

† It is notorious that to an oppoſition of *perſonality* to Lord Bute, and to a ridiculous, unjuſt and acrimonious abuſe of Scotland and Scotchmen he owed, after he had been a ruined man, all the future enjoyments of his life.

The

The well-ſtor'd cellar, ſplendid board,
The ſecret lux'ries of a lord,
You well-know *where* *.

Yet now, the ſaint you laugh to ſcorn,
Treat him as whilom you did *Horne*,
Or *Liberty*, your darling doxie;
Who had, you ſwore, made you her proxy,
The Lord knows *when*, or *where*.

Friend John! you've run a ſwinging ſcore—
At laſt, at death, if not before,
Will come the dreadful *ſettling day*,
When you the long arrear muſt pay,
We all know *where*.

EPIGRAMS.

Dead Dukes.

OLD Briggs on dead dukes had a great deal to ſay,
As we're pleaſantly told it by Madam D'Arblay.
But ſome dukes there are who, when once dead and rotten,
Charles Fox has ſhown plainly had beſt be forgotten.

Worth and Learning compared.

WHILE ſtill to defend Church and King is your plan,
You will prove, tho' no doctor, an honeſt good man.
Tho' in genius and learning inferior by far,
You may rank in true loyalty much *above* par.

---

* His biographer, Mr. Almon, attempts to apologize for his having died, we may ſay, *inſolvent*, by telling us that the chamberlainſhip did not, ſome years, bring in ſo much as he expected. But with an *uncertain* income, ought not he to have acted accordingly? The fact is, that of income he never thought; that he never conſulted any thing but his paſſions, and his appetites. He had three eſtabliſhments, one with his daughter in Groſvenor-ſquare; another with his miſtreſs at Kenſington-gore; and a third, a *ſnuggery* in the Iſle of Wight. Beſides, he was conſtantly moving about to every place where the pleaſures he ſought after were to be found. Is it any wonder then that J. Wilkes died a poor man; though he had not only his own fortune, but that of his daughter at his diſpoſal? To obtain at leaſt a part of the latter ſeems to have been one of his great objects. For this he gave her a Pariſian education, that he might aſſimilate her way of thinking to his own. For this he forbade her all intimate connexion with her mother; and for this he poured upon her effuſions of the moſt ridiculous flattery throughout life.

AMBITION INSATIABLE.

FOREMOST in rank ſtood Satan, ere his fall,
Him Premier Duke 'mid angels we might call.
Ambition's mad exceſs this caſe may ſhow;
Heav'n's firſt high Seraph deem'd himſelf too low!

SPELLING CORRECTED.

THE Tyrant was aſk'd who Napoleon could be?—
Some Corſican ſaint?—"I ſuppoſe ſo," ſaid he.
But 'twas only falſe ſpelling they grounded this folly on;
Not Napoleon—his proper true name is APOLLYON.

TOM T'WHIG'EM.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IN printing a little Epigram of mine (p. 446 of your laſt volume) your printer, by putting the word 'how' with a little letter, has loſt the equivoque, and conſequently the eſſence of it. In 1794 the gallant Howe had repeatedly cruiſed many months without beating the French, for one plain reaſon, viz. that they dare not give him the meeting. Jacobins, during this time, uſed to obſerve ſneeringly, "Lord, How he goes out! and Lord, How he comes in!" At laſt, after appealing to the public in the theatre for advice, the enemy ventured out, and the reſult is well known. Trifling as the lines are, yet, ſince the miſtake has happened, I will thank you to reprint them.

INCOGNITUS.

ON LORD HOWE'S VICTORY, JUNE 1, 1794.

AS traitors ſo lately exclaimed with a grin,
"Lord, How he goes out! and, Lord, How he comes in!
We now to the traitors themſelves may appeal,
With, "Lord, How did they ſtare! and, Lord, How did they feel!"

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

POLWHELE's Defence againſt the Attacks of Mr. Overton and his Friends; which, though long *compoſed*, has been unavoidably poſtponed, ſhall certainly meet with early inſertion.

In anſwer to a Correſpondent we obſerve, that we know of no intended octavo edition of the work to which he refers.

TO OUR READERS.

THE delay in the publication of this Number, which ſhould have appeared on the firſt day of the preſent month, has been occaſioned by the unjuſt demands of the Preſſmen, with which the Printers and Bookſellers very properly refuſed to comply.